DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 751 FL 027 912

AUTHOR	Lee, James F., Ed.; Valdman, Albert, Ed.
TITLE	Form and Meaning: Multiple Perspectives. Issues in Language Program Direction: A Series of Annual Volumes.
ISBN	ISBN-083840846-X
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	329p.; Prepared by the American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs.
AVAILABLE FROM	Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 20 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116. Tel: 800-730-2214 (Toll Free); Fax: 800-730-2215 (Toll Free); Web site: http://www.heinle.com.
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Language Teachers; Action Research; Educational Research; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *Form Classes (Languages); Grammar; Higher Education; Linguistics; Morphology (Languages); Preservice Teacher Education; Reading Processes; Second Language Instruction; Teachers; Word Order
IDENTIFIERS	*Meaning Construction

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers is divided into three parts. After "Introduction" (James F. Lee and Albert Valdman), Part 1, "Theoretical Aspects of Focus on Form," includes "What Form to Focus On? Linguistics, Language Awareness, and the Education of L2 Teachers" (Cristina Sanz); "Five Types of Input and the Various Relationships between Form and Meaning" (James F. Lee); "Processing Instruction as Form-Meaning Connections: Issues in Theory and Research" (Bill VanPatten); and "Attention, Awareness, and Focus on Form Research: A Critical Overview" (Ronald P. Leow). Part 2, "The Teaching Context for Focus on Form," includes "Classroom Talk: Form, Meaning, and Activity Theory" (Celeste Kinginger) and "Meaning and Form in Classroom-Based SLA Research: Reflections from a College Foreign Language Perspective" (Heidi Byrnes). Part 3, "Pedagogical Applications," includes "Toward a Pedagogical Discourse of Grammar: Techniques for Teaching Word-Order Constructions" (Carl S. Blyth); "The Effect of Explicit Training on Successful Circumlocution: A Classroom Study" (Mary Ellen Scullen and Sarah Jourdain); "Relationships between the Process of Reading, Word Inferencing, and Incidental Word Acquisition" (Susanne Rott); and "Linking Form and Meaning in Reading: An Example of Action Research" (Catherine C. Fraser). (Papers contain references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 751

AAUSC
Issues in Language Program Direction
A Series of Annual Volumes

Form and Meaning: Multiple Perspectives

James Lee and Albert Valdman
Editors

1999

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sean Ketchem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL027962

Heinle & Heinle
Thomson Learning™

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Form and Meaning: Multiple Perspectives

James F. Lee and *Albert Valdman*
Editors

American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC)

Issues in Language Program Direction
A Series of Annual Volumes

Series Editor

Sally Sieloff Magnan, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Managing Editor

Charles J. James, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Editorial Board

Virginia Benmaman, College of Charleston
David P. Benseler, Case Western Reserve University
Diane W. Birckbichler, Ohio State University
Alice Omaggio Hadley, University of Illinois
Charles Hancock, Ohio State University
Yukiko Hatasa, University of Iowa
Theodore V. Higgs, San Diego State University
Carol A. Klee, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Claire Kramsch, University of California-Berkeley
John F. Lalande II, University of Illinois
Timothy Light, Western Michigan University
Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro, University of Iowa
Judith Muyskens, Colby-Sawyer College
Benjamin Rifkin, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Wilga M. Rivers, Harvard University
H. Jay Siskin, Brandeis University
Richard V. Teschner, University of Texas at El Paso
Albert Valdman, Indiana University
Joel C. Walz, University of Georgia
Mary Wildner-Bassett, University of Arizona

Style for the AAUSC Series

This publication follows the *Chicago Manual of Style* (Reference Style B). See pages 308–314 in this volume for details about preparing manuscripts for submission.

Form and Meaning: Multiple Perspectives

James F. Lee and *Albert Valdman*
Editors

HH Heinle & Heinle
Thomson Learning™

United States / Australia / Canada / Denmark / Japan / Mexico / New Zealand
Philippines / Puerto Rico / Singapore / Spain / United Kingdom

Acquisition Editor: Wendy Nelson
Marketing Manager: Stephen Frail
Manufacturing Supervisor: Marcia Locke
Production Editor: Sarah Cogliano
Cover Designer: Sue Gerould/Perspectives
Compositor: Roberta Landi
Printer: Odyssey Press, Inc.

COPYRIGHT © 2000 Heinle & Heinle, a division of Thomson Learning.
The Thomson Learning Logo is a registered trademark used herein under license.

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, or information storage and retrieval systems, without the written permission of the publisher.

For permission to use material from this text, contact us:

web www.thomsonrights.com
fax 1-800-730-2215
phone 1-800-730-2214

Heinle & Heinle Publishers
20 Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02116

UK/EUROPE/MIDDLE EAST:
Thomson Learning
Berkshire House
168-173 High Holborn
London, WC1V 7AA, United Kingdom

AUSTRALIA/NEW ZEALAND:
Nelson/Thomson Learning
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205 Australia

CANADA:
Nelson/Thomson Learning
1120 Birchmount Road
Scarborough, Ontario
Canada M1K 5G4

LATIN AMERICA:
Thomson Learning
Seneca, 53
Colonia Polanco
11560 México D.F. México

ASIA (excluding Japan):
Thomson Learning
60 Albert Street #15-01
Albert Complex
Singapore 189969

JAPAN:
Thomson Learning
1-1-1 Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100 0003, Japan

SPAIN:
Thomson Learning
Calle Magallanes, 25
28015-Madrid
Espana

ISBN: 0-8384-0846-X

Printed in the United States of America
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 03 02 01 00 99

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments VII

Introduction IX
James F. Lee and *Albert Valdman*

I. Theoretical Aspects of Focus on Form

What Form to Focus On? Linguistics, Language Awareness, and the Education of L2 Teachers
Cristina Sanz, Georgetown University 3

Five Types of Input and the Various Relationships Between Form and Meaning
James F. Lee, Indiana University 25

Processing Instruction as Form-Meaning Connections: Issues in Theory and Research
Bill VanPatten, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 43

Attention, Awareness, and *Focus on Form* Research: A Critical Overview
Ronald P. Leow, Georgetown University 69

II. The Teaching Context for Focus on Form

Classroom Talk: Form, Meaning, and Activity Theory
Celeste Kinginger, The Pennsylvania State University 99

Meaning and Form in Classroom-based SLA Research: Reflections from a College Foreign Language Perspective
Heidi Byrnes, Georgetown University 125

III. Pedagogical Applications

Toward a Pedagogical Discourse Grammar: Techniques for Teaching Word-Order Constructions
Carl S. Blyth, University of Texas at Austin 183

The Effect of Explicit Training on Successful Circumlocution: A Classroom Study
Mary Ellen Scullen, University of Maryland, College Park
and *Sarah Jourdain*, SUNY Stony Brook 231

Relationships Between the Process of Reading, Word Inferencing, and Incidental Word Acquisition
Susanne Rott, University of Illinois at Chicago 255

Linking Form and Meaning in Reading: An Example of Action Research
Catherine C. Fraser, Indiana University 283

Contributors 305

AAUSC Style Sheet for Authors 308

Membership in AAUSC 315

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The catalyst for this volume was a roundtable on the link between focus on form and focus on meaning held in conjunction with the ACTFL annual meeting organized by Albert Valdman in Nashville in November 1997. The presenters were Susan Gass of Michigan State University, Teresa Pica of the University of Pennsylvania, and Bill VanPatten of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; they rank among the leading second-language acquisition specialists who investigate the role of input in second-language learning from a perspective that addresses centrally the concern of supervisors and coordinators of language instruction programs. The editors of the present volume felt that it would be timely to bring the issue, presented with a specific focus on classroom foreign language instruction, before their peers.

We would like to acknowledge a deep debt of gratitude to the staff of the Committee for Research and Development in Language Instruction (CREDLI) at Indiana University: Deborah Piston-Hatlen, Program Coordinator, assumed, cheerfully and with unswerving commitment, the many tasks involved in the organization of the volume and assisted ably in the screening of the elicited contributions and the preparation of the final chapters for publication; Maria Kim was responsible for the final editing and performed that crucial task with skill and dedication. The authors and editors would also like to extend their thanks to the readers whose insightful comments helped shape a clearer and more succinct treatment of the various facets of the multifarious links between form and meaning represented in this volume: David P. Benseler, Diane W. Birckbichler, Andrew D. Cohen, Joseph Collentine, Cynthia A. Fox, Alice Omaggio Hadley, Yukiko Hatasa, Kathy Heilenman, Richard Kern, Betsy Kerr, Claire Kramsch, John F. Lalande II, Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro, Sally Magnan, Diane Musumeci, Martha Nyikos, Teresa Pica, Benjamin Rifkin, H. Jay Siskin, Richard V. Teschner, Joel Walz, Molly Wieland, Mary E. Wildner-Bassett, and Laurel Willingham-McLain.

Finally, the editorial and production staffs at Heinle & Heinle have helped make the transition from manuscript to published volume a very smooth one. We very much appreciate Wendy Nelson's work. In addition, we would like to thank Sarah Cogliano, Production Editor, Roberta Landi, Compositor, and Marcia Locke, Manufacturing Supervisor.

INTRODUCTION

Current language instruction is characterized by an antinomy between communicative goals and a linear grammatical syllabus. The belief persists among language teachers that effective communication requires the control (often spoken of as mastery) of a predetermined set of grammatical features. Furthermore, these features are to be taught according to a rigorous linear procedure involving explanation, mechanical drill, meaningful exercises, and simulated communicative use. In the final analysis, it is generally the presence of this latter phase that buttresses claims about the communicative nature of language instruction. As Carl Blyth underscores in this volume, this view of the role of grammar rests on a combination of behaviorism, structural linguistics, and cognitive-code theory. It also reduces the scope of grammar to isolated sentences rather than discourse and fails to link structural features—phonological and grammatical—to the functions performed by language, namely linking form with meaning, speech acts, and the marking of social identity.

Research on untutored or naturalistic second-language acquisition has been applied to formal language instruction, associating communication with negotiation of meaning in highly contextualized situations. In reaction to reductionist applications of this research, a renewed emphasis on formal treatment of grammar has emerged. VanPatten (1988) examined the evidence used to argue for or against explicit grammar teaching in language instruction and concluded by calling for a redirection of the debate. He proposed that the debate should not center on whether to teach grammar but rather on *how* to teach grammar. The debate has generated new terminology, and the emphasis on formal treatment of grammar bears the label "focus on form, FonF." In this volume Cristina Sanz adds that, in addition to debating how to teach grammar (i.e., how to FonF), consideration must be given to when to focus on form, and how frequently. In developing his ideas, VanPatten proposed what he termed "processing instruction," based on psycholinguistic research (Lee and VanPatten 1995; VanPatten 1996). Processing instruction relies on structured input activities that direct language learners to process the input for meaning, but in so doing, they must also process it for form. Clearly this work has helped to frame a contemporary discussion of form in language learning and teaching that builds upon the undeniable contributions of structural linguistics, but which also takes into account the broadened view of the relationship between language and communication fostered by the concept of communicative competence and sociolinguistically oriented research.

The chapters of this volume of the AAUSC series seek to define, describe, and account for the terms "form" and "meaning" from different perspectives and conclude with their broadest applications. They fall into three sets: the first group of chapters addresses theoretical and methodological issues; the second examines broad curricular and educational issues; the third section describes more specific pedagogical interventions or studies that point to the pedagogical applicability of some aspects of FonF.

The four chapters of the first section define, describe, and account for the term "form" from different research domains. The overall goal of this part of the volume is to explain for teachers the construct of FonF and the pedagogical approach that, although it steers a straight communicative path, pushes learners to attend to a set of targeted linguistic forms. In the past three decades second-language acquisition (SLA) research has progressively adopted a psycholinguistic orientation. Starting from Krashen's now severely questioned notion of comprehensible input as the engine that drives language acquisition, workers in the field have charted a more complex path that leads from exposure to comprehensible input to learner's production. They have also isolated various stages where, in instructed second- and foreign-language learning, various pedagogical interventions are possible to assist learners in noticing critical features: noticing and awareness of critical features of input, processing and modification of input leading to intake, and producing output that approximates well-formed target language (TL). Earlier research on SLA was dominated by applied linguists associated with the teaching of English as a second language (ESL). The influence of this research was relayed by that conducted in conjunction with Canadian immersion programs. As a result, SLA researchers associated with classroom language learning were in the position of receivers of theoretical concepts and research methodologies rather than initiators. But the total context of these two leading edge areas of SLA differed strikingly from that of the FL classroom. For example, ESL learners have opportunities for natural language learning outside of class, and immersion instruction is imparted to younger learners;

its goal is dual: acquisition of content by means of the TL and incidental—although considerable—learning of the medium for the transmission of content knowledge. In contrast, the research discussed in these four chapters explores the language learning of young adults who receive their input wholly in the FL classroom. It represents a significant shift in SLA research because in this central domain FL researchers take a leading role in formulating theories and devising research methodologies.

Cristina Sanz' opening contribution sets the framework for FonF by situating it in communicatively oriented FL teaching; one might note, however, that as Kinginger insightfully observes in this volume, in our society, the sociocultural setting of our schools imposes severe constraints on such an approach and induces resistance toward it, not only on the part of teachers but also, more important, on the part of the learners themselves. Setting itself the goal of accurate as well as meaningful learner production, FonF opts for a middle course between exclusively meaning-based instruction characterized by Canadian immersion programs and the Natural Approach, and traditional instruction that follows a predetermined linear structural syllabus and focuses on the acquisition of forms for their own sake, labeled Focus on FormS by Michael Long.

Sanz addresses the specific issue of "what" forms to focus on in FonF, for that approach, unlike traditional instruction, does not pretend to teach and correct all forms, but only those that are more difficult to process and, consequently, to acquire. She sets forth two sets of criteria that may be utilized to assess levels of difficulty: external and internal. The latter are general processing factors shared by L1 and L2 acquisition. For example, given the easier processibility of the syntactic order SVO, as demonstrated by restructuring in L1 and also in pidginization, learners will reinterpret other orders according to that syntactic pattern; for example, this accounts for American learners misunderstanding *La saludan los niños* "the children greet her" as "she greets the children." External factors reside in the nature of the forms themselves: frequency, salience (their position in an utterance, whether they are free or bound, their amount of phonetic substance), processing complexity (the demand forms make on short-term memory), communicative value, and variability. Exemplifying these criteria with Spanish forms, Sanz observes that clitic pronouns are more difficult to acquire than morphological features that are traditionally considered complex: namely, the preterit versus imperfect contrast, the subjunctive mood, and the use of the copula verbs *ser* versus *estar*. In connection with the latter contrast, she points out that the level of difficulty is a function of its lack of semantic sharpness that has *stymied grammarians and linguists alike and the variability it shows* across groups of native speakers of Spanish. The fact that some native speakers, especially those that evolve in bilingual environments, such as the Hispanics from East Los Angeles, simplify the grammar by generalizing the use of *estar* raises an interesting sociolinguistic issue. It would seem that to reduce the complexity of forms and thus facilitate their processing and acquisition by learners, FL teachers should aim, at least as a first approximation, at a pedagogical norm that is simpler than the standard version of the TL, generally the most complexified norm found in the TL communities (see Valdman 1992, cited by Blyth in this volume). In the pedagogically oriented coda of her contribution Sanz mentions several useful notions that should be incorporated in teacher training: the distinction between rule-based and exemplar acquisition (the latter type of acquisition is related to chunking, the memorization of individual items, some of phrase length, that the mim-mem approach of the fifties and sixties failed to understand fully) and the cyclical syllabus that allows one to accommodate acquisitional sequences. Difficult structures that cannot fully be put in place at an early stage of instruction because they belong to late stages of acquisition may be presented again periodically with incremental complexification so that learners acquire full control at later stages of instruction.

James Lee starts from the principle, resonated in several of the other contributions of the volume, that acquiring language (versus comprehending it) requires linking meaning to forms that encode it. He then discusses five types of input and the type of pedagogical intervention that may be operated on each: comprehensible input, simplified input, enhanced input, interactionally modified input, and structured input. He argues that the major weakness of Krashen's Comprehensible Input hypothesis, both the *i* and the *i* + 1 threshold points that define that type of input, from the FonF perspective is that they involve meaning only and exclude any reference to form. The notion of simplified input also shares this exclusion of focus on the acquisition of forms without which "the potential for language development has been missed." Research on this construct focuses on the effect on comprehension of various types of simplifications of input—slowed down speech, repetitions, using high frequency vocabulary, and so on. Comprehension also is viewed unidirectionally, that is, as excluding the negotiation that characterizes communicative interactions. In enhanced input, the more proficient interactant proceeds beyond comprehension checks to try to influence the performance of the learner by expanding or recasting the latter's output and providing a more accurate target form. In interactionally modified input, the bidirectional negotiation of meaning between the interactants results in FonF and provides potential for the learner to acquire forms. Structured input goes one step further in providing learners guidance toward the acquisition of specific forms. This guidance is achieved by creating situations in the classroom where only by processing forms for meaning can learners comprehend the input. Lee concludes with broad pedagogical implications of his analysis of input types: to include negotiated interactions that provide learners with input as rich and comprehensible as possible but also lead them to process it so that they can effect the form to meaning linkages inherent in linguistic communication.

In a sense, Bill VanPatten takes off where Lee leaves off by clarifying the nature and role of structured input; but, more important, he lays out the psycholinguistic bases for input processing strategies, namely, the central role of working memory and the limited capacity for processing information that leads learners to focus on meaning-bearing elements in attending to incoming input. They lead, for example, to a preference for lexical items over function words and grammatical endings, and among those grammatical endings, those that have the greatest semantic value over those that are semantically and functionally redundant. The first part of the chapter describes and illustrates with actual pedagogical exemplars the construct of input processing. The pedagogical application of the concept, processing instruction, requires that the focus always be on meaning, that only one form and one function be targeted in an individual task, and that learners always be actively engaged with the input by means of what VanPatten refers to as referential activities that comport an affective dimension, the personal involvement of the learner. The second part addresses criticisms leveled at processing instruction (PI) and counters evidence to the research studies intended to demonstrate the validity of that construct. To the claim that PI is not grounded in any theory, VanPatten responds that this criticism stems from a reductionist interpretation that equates a complex approach with mere exposure to targeted forms. To the criticism that PI was employed only for simple structures he retorts that its superiority to traditional approaches was demonstrated with a wide range of features reputed to be difficult, such as the Spanish subjunctive which involves interclause dependency. After countering alleged research design flaws in comparison studies devised to support it, VanPatten discusses the role of output in PI. He stresses the fact that, although it is necessary, input is not sufficient for developing the ability to use the TL in a communicative setting; attention to output must be included. Thus focus on output is not incompatible with PI. There is one limitation of PI that he grants: the absence of studies about the durable effect of the approach; in experimental studies the retention period seldom exceeded one month. In commenting on the implications of PI for language program direction, VanPatten reminds us that language teachers tend to teach as they were taught and in implementing PI often retain traditional features that, if they have no negative effect on the innovative approach, are without value within its framework.

Ronald Leow focuses on the first stage of the language acquisition chain, awareness. He reviews an impressively large number of experimental studies, most dealing with the learning of FLs rather than ESL, that assess the relationship between various types of awareness and linguistic development. Before forms present in the input can be processed by the learners and stored in available short-term memory, they must be noticed by them. If learners are to attend to meaning while concurrently making a conscious effort to attend to targeted forms, what sort of procedures can make these features more salient so that they can be more readily noticed? According to Leow a considerable amount of SLA research indicates that implicit procedures for awareness enhancement, such as input flooding (providing numerous exemplars of the feature in the input) or writing enhancement (highlighting the targeted feature by various typographical devices), prove to be less effective in accelerating acquisition and advancing language development than a variety of types of explicit approaches: explicit instruction, garden pathing (in which learners are led to notice the targeted feature by being induced to make erroneous overgeneralizations), consciousness raising, and so on. More important, acquired forms are retained for longer periods. Among the pedagogical recommendations that emerge from this thorough review of research is the design of classroom tasks to promote noticing that engage learners in meaningful interactions. These imply more individualized student-centered activities to replace the traditional teacher-centered classroom. A basic problem posed in the empirical study of awareness involves the difficulty of operationalizing the process: new on-line procedures (in addition to think-aloud protocols) and off-line ones (in addition to grammatical judgments) need to be devised. Another issue not mentioned by Leow resides in a potential confounding variable introducing the noncomparability of formal features investigated. For example, obligatory morphosyntactic features carrying little semantic value or functional import such as grammatical gender can be expected to be less noticed than, say, verb forms signaling tense or aspectual distinctions.

The chapters authored by Heidi Byrnes and Celeste Kinginger form a bridge between the properly theoretical and more "applied" parts of this volume. Both examine critically the relationship between pedagogical approaches that attempt to integrate meaningful use of the target language with the development of fluent and accurate production and the instructional setting that necessarily constrains instructional intervention.

Celeste Kinginger's contribution opens with a syllogism about white bears in the snowbound Far North and in the Siberian city of Novoya Zemlya. Whereas illiterates would provide answers based on their experience with bears and the Far North, learners schooled in the rational discourse based on the text-based realities of the classroom most likely would respond that bears are white in that Siberian city because it is situated in the Far North. This "correct" response to the syllogism serves to remind us that the foreign language classroom forms part of a particular sociocultural context that constrains the types of activities linking form and meaning that can take place there. Kinginger points out that what she terms "technological" solutions to promote the meaningful use of language—task-based syllabi, small group and pair work, even Internet exchanges with peers in the target language community, and, we would add, FonF—run counter to the learner's view, fostered by the sociocultural history of our schools, that the classroom is not an environment suitable for authentic communicative exchanges but for activities involving the decontextualized use of language. This no doubt accounts for requests for more focus on form (grammar in their parlance) that foreign language students make of instructors who organize the class around meaningful communicative activities. The objective of her chapter is not only to document a reality that we sometimes wish to forget but to lead us to reflect on the role of foreign language instruction as part of the general school or university curriculum. She challenges us to ask ourselves to what degree we wish to have our classrooms become appropriate environments for communicative interaction and, if we chose to answer affirmatively, to make learners aware of the difference between discourse that reflects natural language use and discourse that is a way of understanding, namely, the rational decontextualized use of words.

Heidi Byrnes enumerates the numerous flaws of the teaching of foreign languages at the collegiate level. She highlights the difficulty of conducting meaningful research oriented toward the study of the interactive development of meaning and form and concludes by outlining a proper curriculum in which targeted acquisition of content does permit the development of a significant level of ability in the target language. As we are poignantly aware, the basic two to four semester sequence is woefully inadequate for the development of any useful linguistic ability, particularly interactive communicate skills that require the capability to comprehend and interpret a broad range of discourse types and fluent speech, as well as to achieve a command of the fundamental meaning-form links of the target languages. But Byrnes asserts, in addition, that this prototypical organization of foreign language courses hinders SLA research that can inform instructional practices. It also fosters reductionist Focus on FormS rather than the FonF that is the topic of this volume. For example, few SLA studies observe longitudinal language development. In addition, Byrnes points out, these reduced instructional sequences limit the possibilities for the types of instructional intervention that emerge from a FonF orientation, such as input enhancement and consideration of fixed developmental orders.

In the graduate research departments that Byrnes targets, a dysfunctional separation is instituted between content courses taught by the "real" faculty, generally literature scholars, and language courses viewed as peripheral to the intellectual mission of the academic unit. These are either entrusted to marginal instructional personnel—TAs, part-time instructors, or nontenurable faculty—or, increasingly, outsourced to language centers.

For Byrnes, in addition to the downgrading of SLA research and development, this has the deleterious effect of depriving advanced learners, those who expect to acquire a professional level of ability in the TL, opportunities for continued FonF. The curriculum she proposes, which is being implemented in the German Department at Georgetown University, eliminates the conventional separation of skill versus content instruction. From the very beginning students are involved in content- and task-based activities the ultimate objective of which is the imparting of multiple literacies designed to provide them with opportunities for engagement with the culture of TL communities, the construction of coherent and cohesive discourse commensurate with their level of linguistic development, and critical thinking. One of the outcomes of the proposed long-term curriculum, Byrnes suggests, is to unify the faculty of language departments in a common endeavor and to promote greater interest in language acquisition in the highly specific collegiate setting.

The third part of this volume addresses pedagogical issues more directly. One of the limitations of FonF resides in its somewhat reductionist interpretation of linguistic form. Most research and pedagogical applications have centered on morphology (verbal tense and aspect, and gender and person agreement, for example). Few studies have borne on syntax and even fewer on aspects of forms that have pragmatic or sociolinguistic function. The four studies in this section fill this lacuna. This section consists of a chapter that explores the link between FonF and the processing and construction of discourse, and three chapters describing experimental studies. Two of these experimental studies assess the effectiveness of instructional practices: the first, of a technique useful for oral communicative interactions, and the second, of training that might facilitate reading comprehension. Two studies involve focus on lexical form; the other involves function words that contribute to textual cohesion.

Carl Blyth begins by pointing out that one of the obstacles to imparting a command of the spoken language lies in the reliance on sentence structures characteristic of the written standard language, in particular those that are supposed to express complete and perfect thoughts by adherence to the "logical" SVO order, for example, *John kissed Mary*, which contrasts with those more characteristic of oral communicative interactions such as *It was John who kissed Mary* or *Who John kissed was Mary*. According to the functional grammar perspective he adopts, the order of nouns in declarative sentences not only indicates case relations but, especially in interactive speech, also expresses a variety of pragmatic aspects of speech: the type and degree of information carried by sentence constituents, communicative intent, emphasis, and so on. In authentic interactive speech it is by various rearrangements of the linear SVO order involving inversions, clefting, and pronominalizations that speakers signal these pragmatic factors. Blyth argues that, although long thought to be impervious to formal presentation, these pragmatically conditioned syntactic devices are amenable to systematic pedagogical treatment within a communicative approach by various activities that focus on form: garden pathing, structured input, input enhancement, and communicative tasks that require learners to perceive or produce targeted forms for their successful completion.

Turning his attention to the training of foreign language teachers, Blyth stresses the need to provide them formal instruction on the structure of discourse. Teachers need to become aware that constructing written and oral discourse requires attention to pragmatic appropriateness as well as grammatical accuracy. He admits that a focus on aspects of well-formed discourse such as topicality, presupposition, and referentiality is best reserved for more advanced levels of instruction. However, he also suggests that, although techniques for the analysis of discourse may not lead directly to more fluent communicative ability, their merit is to raise awareness about the organization of discourse, surely one of the legitimate goals of formal foreign language instruction and one that contributes to broader educational objectives of our discipline. He concludes by showing how informatics promises to enhance the study of discourse by providing unlimited access to authentic materials available on the Internet and in massive corpora and by making available software tools for automatic analysis and treatment.

Like Blyth, Mary Ellen Scullen and Sarah Jourdain challenge the long-held belief that the role of language teachers is to impart phonology, morphosyntax, and lexicon and that pragmatic aspects of language are best acquired by communicative use in the target language environment. The consequence of the traditional view is that the classroom learner never acquires knowledge and skills required for successful negotiation of meaning. These two researchers observe correctly that, given the lexical limitations of learners, successful communication requires the ability to use circumlocution strategies to describe an object whose lexical designation is unknown. They identify four types of strategies, two of which—superordinate and analogy—require establishing semantic links with the targeted unknown lexical item, and two of which—function and description—require mastery of a syntactic construction, relativization. Learners in the experimental group who were provided explicit training in the four types of strategies circumlocuted better than the control group. The study underscores the importance of FonF for more successful performance of communicative tasks. It also invites the extension of systematic attention to form-meaning links to the relatively neglected domain of the lexicon. Two of the strategies identified by Scullen and Jourdain require acquainting instructors with the concept of lexical relations, including hyperonymy, synonymy, antonymy. The other two strategies provide another opportunity to demonstrate the fundamental premise of functional grammar, namely, the interdependency between form and function: relative clauses do not serve primarily to lead learners to construct more complex sentences but to describe things and tell what they are used for.

Among cognitively oriented specialists of second language reading research there appears to be general agreement that reading texts represents the optimal way to acquire new vocabulary. From his comprehensible input exposure perspective, Krashen has asserted that words are best acquired by processing and comprehending them in their natural context, namely connected texts. Susanne Rott put this notion to a test, as it were, by devising an experimental study designed to examine the relationship between overall comprehension of written texts and the extraction of the meaning of a targeted individual unfamiliar word by means of inferencing and reading strategies on the part of intermediate learners of German. If Krashen is correct, we would expect that those learners who make use of global reading strategies in which focus is on deriving the overall meaning of the text also would acquire and retain the meaning of targeted word lexicon. The results show that, although the subjects noticed a targeted unfamiliar word crucial to an understanding of the whole text and made an acceptable semantic inference upon encountering the first of its seven occurrences in compounds, few transferred that inference to the other instances of the targeted word, and only one of the eight learners retained the meaning two weeks after the experiment. The limited number of subjects of this qualitative study restricts the scope of the conclusions to be drawn, but the results support the claim that comprehension and production involve different cognitive processes even though they are related in some way. In other words, comprehension of a text does not necessarily lead to productive word knowledge. The results also suggest that activities that focus on lexical form, such as the ones that refer to various semantic relations (synonymy, hyperonymy, etc.), might enhance more successful and more rapid vocabulary learning. A clearer pedagogical implication of the study is that vocabulary learning constitutes an aspect of language learning subject to great individual variation. Consequently, instructors need to guide learners to use a wide variety of local and global strategies.

Catherine Fraser's study offers an excellent example of classroom action research. It was inspired by a theoretical study of the relationship between identification of anaphoric links and the process of reading (Berkemeyer 1994), which might be viewed as a type of local or bottom-up FonF. In a sense, Fraser's own study constitutes a replicative pedagogical verification of previous research, an activity the present editors warmly recommend to fellow specialists in language instruction. The research protocol she tested with advanced learners of German—seeking coreferential links between anaphoric pronouns and their textual referents—validates the theoretical construct that inspired it. But, at the same time, it can be transformed into a postreading task (an "instructional event") within the framework of the widely accepted approach to reading comprehension wherein students' confrontation with a text is preceded by global activities and followed by local activities, some of which, such as the one emerging from Fraser's experiment, have the added advantage of acquainting students with basic metalinguistic terminology. It is interesting, though, that, as she notes, her subjects preferred to search for form/meaning links rather than taking the easy way out of metalinguistic labeling.

Works Cited

Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Valdman, Albert. 1992. Authenticity, Variation, and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom. In *Text and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study,* edited by C. Kramsch and S. McConnell-Ginet, 79–97. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

VanPatten, Bill. 1988. How Juries Get Hung: Problems with the Evidence for a Focus on Form. *Language Learning* 38: 243–260.

______. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

PART I

Theoretical Aspects of Focus on Form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT FORM TO FOCUS ON?
LINGUISTICS, LANGUAGE AWARENESS, AND THE EDUCATION OF L2 TEACHERS

Cristina Sanz
Georgetown University

Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to argue that second language acquisition (SLA) research has a role to play in the education of L2 teachers as a means of developing the linguistic awareness they need to make informed decisions in their teaching practice. Two major decisions, in particular, involve grammar teaching and error correction. In classroom SLA research these are two major issues that are now being revisited under the term "Focus on Form" (Long 1991).

Obviously, the discussion of whether to direct the learner's attention to form in the classroom assumes that the context of the teaching is communicative. In a teacher-centered course driven by a structural syllabus, there is no space for the question of whether to focus the learner's attention on form, since the course is all about form, not about meaning. This type of teacher-centered structural syllabus is what Long calls Focus on FormS (1991).[1] Only when the teacher develops communicative lessons in the context of a communicative syllabus whose goal is to develop communicative competence, that is, only when the focus is on meaning, can we begin to consider whether the learner would benefit from any technique that might momentarily shift attention from meaning to form. This type of learner-centered communicative syllabus is what Long (1991) calls Focus on Form (FonF).

Motivation for research on the effects of FonF techniques comes from reports on the linguistic outcomes of the Canadian immersion programs (Swain 1984) where, despite exposure to constant good quality input for years, L2 learners' production differs from the norm in use of verbal morphemes and articles. This has been taken as evidence that exposure to input alone does not lead to full development of the L2 grammar, an observation of great interest to SLA researchers. The problem is one of accuracy, not of communicative effectiveness. Therefore, this evidence is also of interest for academic language programs whose goal is to produce accurate L2 users. The argument for FonF is the following: Focus on FormS instruction, that is, instruction based on forms, does not lead to acquisition (think of the grammar-translation method and its outcome), and the exclusive use of meaning-based instruction (i.e., immersion programs) does not produce satisfactory results either. In short, without input, acquisition does not happen, but exposure to input alone does not lead to L2 accuracy. Consequently, although focusing on form is not always necessary, doing so makes FonF more efficient than just providing input alone (Doughty and Williams 1998).

Once it has been established that FonF is necessary in some cases and more efficient in others, decisions still remain to be made, such as when (in the syllabus, in the lesson, in the learner's stage of acquisition) to FonF; how to FonF (i.e., which techniques to use, how explicit to make FonF); how frequently to use FonF; and so on, decisions that are discussed in the last chapter of Doughty and Williams (1998). These are important decisions, but in this chapter we will concentrate on only one of them, namely, what form to choose as the objective toward which learners' attention will be directed. It is important to keep in mind the context of FonF: a meaning-based, student-centered syllabus where not all forms are explicitly taught or corrected. The principles of this context call on teachers to make intentional decisions regarding which forms to focus on.

When asked, teachers and learners can readily distinguish forms that are "easy" from those that are "difficult," or, as researchers call them, "late acquired." However, as Doughty and Williams (1998, p. 213) put it, "Teacher intuition and needs assessment as evidence of learner difficulty alone may be insufficient or, at least, may not be the most efficient basis for making instructional choices." For example, most Spanish teachers[2] would mention the preterit/imperfect, subjunctive/indicative, and *ser/estar* distinctions as "difficult" to learn (and to teach). Nevertheless, research shows that forms related to word order in Spanish, such as subject/verb agreement and clitic placement, are problematic not only at the intermediate level (VanPatten 1984; LoCoco 1987, for interpretation data), but also for advanced (Sanz and Bigelow 1998) and near-native speakers of Spanish (Sanz 1998, for production data). Consequently, research can help language teachers identify "difficult" elements of the L2 grammar. Research can also explain why these forms are difficult to acquire. Teachers can profit from this information in many ways: For instance, it can prove useful to help them understand why learners produce certain errors, and it can provide them with direction as to how they can best tailor their teaching to adapt it to learners' processes by providing feedback on certain forms at certain times.

What Forms to Focus On

As DeKeyser (1998, p. 45) put it, "Although rule complexity is a likely criterion for a focus on form, complexity is an elusive term to define"[3]; consequently, researchers do not always agree on whether some of the most frequently taught rules are simple or complex. We can differentiate between easy and complex rules by taking into account learners' behavior, experienced teachers' rankings (Robinson 1996, cited in DeKeyser), or students' own rankings. We have already noted that teachers and learners of Spanish tend to focus on differences in aspect and mood, such as *ser/estar*, preterit/imperfect, and subjunctive/indicative, which are encoded by semantically complex morphological forms. Although advanced learners still have problems with verb/subject agreement, clitic placement and agreement, and superfluous use of an explicit subject, it is not common for teachers or learners to add them to the list. Perhaps this is because Spanish morphology, being much richer than that of English, tends to monopolize teachers' attention given the context of their teaching. Morphological problems may also be more salient and easier to remember. Think of this: "It is difficult to know when to use preterit or imperfect" versus "It is difficult to know where to place direct object pronouns and make them agree with the verb." That is, while the first problem is localized (choose one form or the other), the second has to do with relationships among components of the sentence, the morphology of both the verb and pronoun, and the placement of the latter. A study on Teacher Talk (Sanz 1998) reveals that teachers are conscious of the lexical and morphological modifications they make in their speech to students, but not of their syntactic modifications: Only one out of eighteen mentioned word order, while all mentioned the lexicon and the past. This section is devoted to explain why word order in Spanish, and specifically preverbal object clitics, are difficult to acquire.

Object pronouns, the last remnants of the Latin case system, are used to refer anaphorically to an entity that has already appeared in the discourse. They represent an extreme example of having more than one form for one function since there are fourteen (fifteen in the case of Castilian Spanish) different forms that express differences in case, gender, and number. When one compares the clitic system of English with that of Spanish and the rest of the Romance languages, it is obvious that the latter are inherently more difficult. Moreover, clitics can appear in two positions: before and after the verb. In some cases, the speaker has a choice, as in *lo voy a ver / voy a verlo* (I'm going to see him); in other cases, the position is categorical, as in *lo veo* (I see him). The position in which the clitic appears alters sentential word order; Spanish has a considerably more flexible word order than English. In terms of linguistic complexity, then (DeKeyser 1998), object clitics in Spanish can be classified as complex forms.

Both interpretation and production data show that object pronouns are acquired late by learners of Spanish as a first language (L1) (Hernández Pina 1984; López-Ornat 1994) and as an L2 (LoCoco 1987; VanPatten 1984; Andersen 1989; Sanz 1998; Sanz and Bigelow 1998), which suggests that they are, in fact, complex forms. In addition, one must also consider a variety of different factors that add to the complexity of the form: processing strategies; influence from the L1; input characteristics such as lack of negative evidence, salience and frequency of the forms; semantic redundancy; and processing complexity, among others. Some factors are internal to the learner, while others are linked to the characteristics of the form or the nature of the input. More than any one factor, it is the combination of factors that makes the form more complex. The paragraphs that follow will look at both the internal and external factors.

Internal Factors

Just like children learning Spanish as an L1, adult beginning-language learners interpret a sentence like *Lo besa la chica* "Him kisses the girl" (She kisses him) as "He kisses the girl." That is, they decide that the noun phrase before the verb is the subject of the verb. This behavior results from application of a *processing strategy* known as the first noun or NVN=SVO strategy, in which word order is used to assign functions to noun phrases at the sentence level (Slobin and Bever 1982).[4] When applying this strategy, learners assign subject (agent) status to the preverbal noun and

Figure 1

Input	**Learners' Intake**
A. La saludan los niños. ***Her greet (plural morpheme) the children.*** The children greet her.	*She greets the children verb morphology filtered out pronoun form filtered out
B. Me gustan los aguacates. ***Me please (plural) the avocados.*** I like avocados	*me = subject, aguacate = object verb morphology filtered out pronoun form filtered out
C. Regresare mañana. null subject be back (person morpheme) I'll be back tomorrow.	*emphatic *I* will come back tomorrow subject missing, needs to be added verb morphology filtered out
D. A Maria la saludan ellos ***To Maria her greet (plural) they.*** They greet Maria.	*She greets them case marker 'a' filtered out pronoun and verb morphology filtered out

Source: VanPatten and Sanz (1995).

object status to the noun in postverbal position. It is a well-known strategy in L1 acquisition and one that scholars (VanPatten 1984; LoCoco 1987) have shown is used by native speakers of English to interpret Spanish sentences. Spanish is, in principle, an SVO language just like English. However, it relies on both morphology and syntax for function assignment, which allows it to have a more flexible word order: OVS, SOV, and OV sentences are common in all standard varieties of Spanish. Therefore application of the NVN=SVO strategy causes the learner to advance the wrong interpretation. Moreover, as pointed out by VanPatten (1996), application of this strategy has other, perhaps more serious, drawbacks: Beginning L2 learners of Spanish, whose cognitive resources are taxed in the process of extracting meaning from the input, filter out key cues present in the input. These cues are case markers of a morphological nature, such as clitic and verbal morphology and the personal '*a*', which precedes direct objects, as in *Saluda a Maria* "you/he/she greet(s) Mary." This filtering out of key morphemes is responsible for the delay in their acquisition. Figure 1 presents a summary of the relationship between the input learners are exposed to and the intake available for further processing after application of the strategy during on-line input processing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Application of the NVN=SVO strategy during on-line input processing may have consequences for the acquisition of more than one aspect of the grammar. Bates' (1976) data from Italian L1 acquisition shows a relationship between a change of the first noun strategy and the child's control over subject/verb agreement. Specifically, decline in reliance on the first noun strategy positively correlated with the child's control over subject/verb agreement, at the same time that frequency of explicit subjects began to decline, too. Certain characteristics of Spanish L2 production can also be explained as the result of application of the first noun strategy. Andersen (1989) notes that SVO word order is always preserved in learners' production. VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) explain the following characteristics of Spanish L2 production as a consequence of the use of NVN=SVO strategy:

1. incorrect use of object pronouns as subjects of the sentence, as in **lo estudia español,* to mean "he studies Spanish," instead of "él estudia español";
2. incorrect placement of object pronouns, as in **yo quiero lo,* instead of "yo lo quiero" (I want it);
3. absence of the case marker "*a*" as in **yo vi Pepe,* instead of "yo vi a Pepe" (I saw Pepe);
4. delay in the acquisition of certain verbs that require the subject to be in postverbal position, as in **yo gusto bananas,* instead of "me gustan las bananas" (to me please the bananas); and
5. overuse of the explicit subject even in late stages of acquisition (Spanish being a prodrop language) as in **?Ayer yo fui al cine, después yo volví a casa,* instead of "Ayer fui al cine después volví a casa" (I went to the movies, then I went home).

Sanz and Bigelow (1998) is a quantitative analysis of word-order-related problems in the oral and written production of advanced learners of Spanish. Results from the analyses do not suggest that preverbal object clitics or, for that matter, any of the forms linked to control over word order mentioned in this chapter are difficult to notice, interpret, or comprehend but easy to produce, a position that DeKeyser and Sokalski (1996) defend.[5]

That is, using the NVN=SVO strategy for processing input may have consequences for the acquisition of more than one aspect of both the L1 and L2 grammars. If Spanish OVS, SOV, and OV sentences are common in standard varieties of Spanish and application of the strategy leads the learner to the wrong interpretation, why doesn't the learner modify the strategy at an earlier stage?

External Factors

The answer lies in the intrinsic characteristics of the forms as well as in the nature of the input to which learners are exposed. As Doughty and Williams (1998) put it, "The L2 may contain potentially misleading information, so that learners will assume that their L1 forms are directly transferable to the L2, as in Andersen's 'transfer to somewhere' principle" (p. 227). First of all, English is more of an SVO language than Spanish is; English relies on syntax rather than morphology to establish relationships among elements in a sentence. Second and equally important, although the rule (NVN=SVO) does not hold true in all the cases in which it could be applied (reliability of the rule), the number of cases to which it applies (the scope of the rule) is important. This is so because, as the unmarked pattern, SVO not only is common in standard input but is even more common in simplified varieties such as foreigner talk and teacher talk (Santilli 1996; Sanz 1998), which are precisely the varieties language learners are exposed to. In these varieties, SVO sentences with explicit subjects abound. To put it in another way, the L1 leads to maintenance of the strategy, and the L2 input confirms its appropriateness decreasing the *frequency* of key, non-SVO structures that could trigger a change in the strategy.

Another attribute that has been frequently used to explain why some forms are acquired before others is *salience*. Salient forms are most likely to be acquired first. Object clitics, because of their form and position in the sentence, are difficult to perceive. According to Peters' (1985) cognitive analysis of how units are singled out in input processing, there are several reasons why clitics are an example of units that are difficult to isolate for processing: They are unstressed and monosyllabic and tend to appear at the beginning of a sentence after a pause, where they are difficult to perceive. The same can be said of the other morphemes encoding syntactic relationships, like verbal morphemes and personal "*a*."

Processing complexity is determined in part by the ease with which the form is perceived. It is also determined by boundaries and movement across those boundaries because learners are initially tightly constrained against the movement and separation of elements (DeKeyser 1998). Accordingly, Pienemann (1984, 1989) asserts that the earlier acquisition of certain constructions ensues from the fact that they involve little demand on short-term memory or little manipulation of elements. Preverbal clitics are complex to process because they entail movement across phrase boundaries. Moreover, the greater the distance between the clitic and its referent, the greater the demands it makes on short-term memory. Clitics agree in gender and number with their referent, which means that gender and number information about the referent needs to be held in short-term memory while other language input is processed until the clitic appears (Carreiras, Garnham, and Oakhill 1996).

A different type of complexity is known as *functional complexity*, and it refers to the degree to which the form-function relationship is transparent. DeKeyser (1998) chooses verb endings in the Romance languages as an example: There are many morphemes, and each encodes number, person, tense, mood, and aspect. Therefore verbal morphology is functionally complex in those languages; so are clitics. They are themselves morphemes marked for case, gender, and number.

In fact, the Spanish clitic system[6] might be too complex even for native speakers! Studies in Spanish dialectology (Lapesa 1968; Klein-Andreu 1981) and sociolinguistics (Silva-Corvalán 1994) show that the use of clitics across Spanish-speaking areas varies greatly. The system, in its standard form, has different morphemes for case, gender, and number. However, most of the varieties, including Peninsular varieties with access to normative use, have lost one of the distinctions known variously as *laísmo* (i.e., *No la digas nada* instead of *No le digas nada* (Don't tell her anything); *leísmo* (i.e., *le vió ayer* instead of *lo vió ayer* (s/he saw him yesterday). *Laísmo* and *leísmo* are the consequence of the loss of case distinction. Number is also lost, as in *le trajo muchos regalos a los chicos* instead of *les trajo muchos regalos a los chicos* (you/he/she brought many presents for the kids). And in those geographic areas where Spanish is in contact with other languages, as in the Basque area, Peru and the United States, clitics are dropped in certain linguistic contexts.[7] The paradigm is simplified overall in the number of distinctions it makes. Clitics are dropped in contexts where the monolingual norm would require their use, including double clitics in preverbal position, as in *El lápiz, no me dió* (the pencil not me gave) instead of *El lápiz, no me lo dió* (the pencil, not me it gave; he did not give me the pencil). In these cases, it is the direct object clitic that is eliminated. Although certain cases can be explained as a result of transfer, modifications in the use of clitics in these varieties seem to be motivated

Figure 2

"El hombre esta decidiendo qué quiere comer. Él (1) decide comer *dos patatas*. Primero Ø él (1) lava las patatas (3) en la fregadera. Entonces Ø él (1) pela dos patatas con un cuchillo. Proximo, Ø él (1) corta las patatas (3) en pedazos pequeños. Entonces Ø pone las patatas (3) en una cazuela y *las* calienta por un minuto o algo como eso. Ø El (1) tiera las patatas (3) en la cazuela para que caliente (4) bien. Entonces él (1) Ø pone las patatas (3) en un plato y *los* (4) come."

(1) Oversuppliance of subject pronouns.
(2) Use of a DO pronoun as subject.
(3) Oversuppliance of full NP in DO position.
(4) Lack of agreement.

Consequence of 1–4: SVO structures with explicit subject and object.

Source: Sanz (1994).

by a tendency to follow and accelerate an internal trend (Silva-Corvalán 1994) that has been shaping the evolution of the Spanish clitic system for centuries.

Other intrinsic characteristics of the form, such as its *communicative value* (meaningfulness), contribute to its belated emergence within the acquisition process. According to VanPatten (1996), forms high in communicative value are processed before others, and the acquisition of forms for which there is no communicative need is delayed "even though learners notice the form or it is pointed out through instruction" (DeKeyser 1998). From the learner's perspective, how necessary are object clitics to convey meaning during production? Learners can repeat the full noun phrase in subject and object position, keep basic word order, and still make sense. The resulting structures are not nativelike, and learners cannot convey nuances such as change in focus. But for learners whose goal is to be understood rather than to be accurate, it does the job. Figure 2 above is an example of such behavior.[8]

The way a form is acquired is linked to its formal characteristics (Skehan 1998): Some forms are learned through exemplars, others through rules. This concept is related to experiments in cognitive psychology and second language acquisition that investigate the contrast between explicit and implicit learning.[9] The results thus obtained have generated a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

lot of discussion. Those who believe that participants in the implicit condition learn more cannot always conclude whether they have learned items (exemplars) or rules. It seems likely that not all forms are learned in the same way: Some forms cannot be learned through exemplars. According to DeKeyser (1998), both the amount of surface variation that tends to conceal the rule and the distance between the co-occurring elements are important. He offers subject/verb agreement as an example of a form that cannot be learned through exemplars: The ways in which subject and verb are marked for plural differ, and other elements, such as adverbs, interfere and increase the distance between subject and verb. The same arguments that show the processing and functional complexity of the Spanish clitic system explain the impossibility of learning such a system through exemplars.

In summation, there are easy forms and complex forms. Basic word order need not be taught in Spanish. Neither do we need to teach adjective/noun position, even though it is different in English and in Spanish.[10] They are easy structures to acquire. Spanish object clitics, however, fall within the second category. Despite their inherent complexity, they are acquired by adult L2 learners as a result of exposure to input. Unlike some phonological aspects of the language, object clitics are learnable. Therefore, although a Focus on Form (i.e., FonF) treatment might not be *necessary* for the acquisition of the form, it is *efficient* insofar as it can expedite it. The argument in favor of choosing object clitics for a Focus on Form treatment is one of efficiency. If easy rules (adjective/noun order in Spanish) are acquired early and easily (few errors are made), then we do not need to teach them. Moreover, if we find that forms are grouped into certain clusters and that by teaching one we positively affect the acquisition of others—that is, we expedite the acquisition of other related forms—we should give these preference. Sanz (1996) suggests that the effects of a treatment focused on preverbal clitics could be felt on the acquisition of other aspects of the grammar related to word order, such as subject/verb agreement, non-SVO patterns (including verbs like *gustar*), and explicit use of subject.

Focus on Form and the Teaching of Complex Forms

From a pedagogical perspective, the way clitics have been introduced to students in the Spanish classroom has been the following: One lesson presents all eight forms of the direct object clitics, followed by a lesson presenting the six forms of the indirect object clitics. Finally, an explanation (always with examples) on how to combine both forms is provided. An explanation that includes the rules on their use is given, and it is followed by substitution drills that require students to produce, rather than interpret, and that typically present mostly isolated sentences. As pointed out in Sanz (1994), it is odd that clitics, which are suprasentential in nature, appear in unconnected sentences in this type of exercises. One of the items in the substitution task could be *Pedro compró una tiracapota* >> *Pedro ..... compró*, where the correct answer is *Pedro la compró*. There is no need to understand *tiracapota* (a made-up word): After *compró*, it can be only the DO, and it is feminine (it ends in *a*). *Pedro compró una tiracapota para su chuculetillo*: The second has to be the indirect object because it appears after *para*, and it ends in *o*; therefore it is masculine. This is a perfect example of a Focus on FormS approach to teaching the clitics: Nowhere in the lesson does meaning have any bearing (see Salaberry 1997, p. 448 for an example).

A FonF way of approaching the teaching of clitics, called *processing instruction*, is based on the latest research on input processing (VanPatten 1996) and is implemented in *¿Sabías que...?* (VanPatten, Lee, and Ballman 1996), a first-year college Spanish textbook. Although the grammar section is divided into explanation and practice, both are different from the traditional model. In a nutshell, the explanation is geared toward making the learners aware of the difference between Spanish and English word order and the placement of object pronouns. Also, the explanation stresses the student's need to change the strategy that leads him/her to wrong interpretations of sentences whose structure is not SVO. Moreover, the different forms are not all introduced at the same time but rather presented one at a time. The exercises provide practice on decoding; that is, the students are presented with structured input (input with a high concentration of clitics) that they have to interpret and respond to. The input is always meaning-bearing, and both sentential and suprasentential input is provided. No production is required. Processing instruction focuses on changing the use of the first noun strategy as an interpretation device rather than on producing clitics accurately. This approach to the teaching of clitics, which is supported by experimental evidence (VanPatten and Cadierno 1993; VanPatten and Sanz 1995), is an example of how SLA theory and research and cognitive psychology inform language pedagogy.

More on this topic can be read in "Processing Instruction as Form-Meaning Connections: Issues and Theory and Research" (VanPatten later in this text).

Research on processing instruction shows that Spanish word order (preverbal clitics) is amenable to FonF. However, processing instruction is one type of FonF. Are all FonF techniques alike? The answer is no in the sense that some techniques are more explicit than others (see Doughty and Williams 1998 for a classification of FonF techniques). Because not all forms are learned in the same way (Skehan 1998), not all forms should be taught in the same way (Hulstijn 1995). Here is where the exemplar-based versus rule-based acquisition distinction might come in handy. It is also intuitively attractive to hypothesize that more complex forms require more obtrusive (explicit) FonF techniques than easier forms do. For example, although recasts have been shown to make a difference in the acquisition of adverb placement, they might not be "powerful" enough to affect learners' acquisition of OV structures (Ortega and Long 1997). In this realm, more obtrusive techniques, such as processing instruction, have been shown to work.[11] Obviously, it is important in deciding how to teach forms to know why some forms are acquired earlier than others and how forms are learned. This underscores the need to devote part of a course in language teacher education to second-language acquisition.

Focus on Form and L2 Teacher Education

We cannot extrapolate from experimental results and apply processing instruction (PI) to the teaching of all forms (lexical items, phonemes, morphosyntax) and rules. PI can help expedite the acquisition of certain forms but not of others. Moreover, PI is directed to modify input processing strategies, thereby subverting the learner's natural strategies for processing input. PI results in more intake to feed the next set of processes in charge of restructuring the system. Production-based techniques are also necessary to help the learner put acquired knowledge to use since not all techniques work with all forms and not all techniques help with all the different processes involved in L2 acquisition. In other words, aspects of the acquisition of a language (sound system, syntax, vocabulary) vary; grammar forms (subject/verb agreement, adjective/noun placement) differ as well; and the processes involved in acquisition (input processing, restructuring, production) are not the same. Awareness of all these differences is necessary for teachers to make educated decisions on how to approach grammar teaching and error correction.

Knowing about learners' processes helps teachers rethink instructional sequences, choose the technique(s) that best complements the acquisition of the form, while simultaneously assisting them in rethinking expectations about learner progress. This all amounts to instilling in teachers the understanding that errors will occur no matter how intense and obtrusive their error correction and grammatical explanations are or how much input and opportunity for interaction they provide. Formal instruction can expedite the process, but it cannot change the route of development.

The chapter has focused on one aspect of the many decisions teachers need to make regarding the teaching of grammar and error correction, namely *what* form to focus on. Object clitics and their placement were chosen to exemplify the complexity of the language acquisition process, a complexity that results from the many factors internal to the learner as well as others inherent to the form itself. Most important, it has been established that no one factor, but rather a combination of many factors, is responsible for the delay in the acquisition of the form. Other forms could have been used to exemplify the complexity of the language acquisition process as the next two paragraphs will succinctly argue.

The aspectual distinction made by *ser/estar* is one of those cases in which the rule is so complex that not even linguists can state it. Semantically complex in nature and tied to discoursal factors, it is a problematic area because the difference between these two copulas is not semantically transparent. The use of one or the other is categorical in some cases as in *Pedro está enfermo* (Pedro is ill) and *Ester es inteligente* (Ester is intelligent). In other cases, it is optional and semantically different, as in *Daniel es bueno* versus *Daniel está bueno* (Daniel is good versus Daniel is good looking). Both descriptive and prescriptive linguists have tried without success to find rules that account for all cases (Bello [1860] 1970; Bull 1965; Falk 1979; Luján 1981). Grammarians' lack of success is due in part to extreme regional and social differences in the use of both copulas. For example, *Mi hija está inteligente* (My daughter is intelligent) is judged ungrammatical in Spain, while it is common in East Los Angeles. *Ser* and *estar* are in a process of change in native varieties of Spanish, a change that consists of the replacement of *ser* by *estar* in different contexts, as in *Ariadna está coja* (Ariadna limps) instead of *Ariadna es coja* (Ariadna is permanently handicapped). The temporality of the characteristic that was expressed by *estar* is now expressed as *Ariadna va coja* (Ariadna walks limping) (Silva-Corvalán 1986).[12] The change started in Latin, where the use of *stare* was heavily restricted, but in late Latin it had already occupied certain positions previously held by *esse*. In bilingual varieties (in the United States), where speakers have reduced access to the standard conservative variety, the change is accelerated. This tendency is not limited to Spanish, but rather seems to be part of the "genetic endowment" of Romance languages. For example, Sanz and González (1995) point to a similar trend in a southern variety of Catalan.[13]

L1 research shows that children's acquisition of Spanish copula differs from adults' in that the former begins with a preference for *estar* over *ser* (Lopez-Ornat 1994; Hernandez-Pina 1984). SLA research on this grammar point in a classroom context[14] carried out from a cognitive perspective (VanPatten 1987) has established the existence of several stages in the acquisition of these forms; the first is Ø copula. The existence of this stage relates the acquisition of Spanish to the nature of copula in native varieties of English, such as African-American vernacular and simplified varieties of Spanish-like foreigner and caretaker talk. It is also possible to establish a link between the second stage and copula in Spanish-based Creoles such as Palenquero.[15]

Finally, if choosing the appropriate form to focus on is one of the many decisions teachers need to make, then *when* to focus on form is equally important. Unfortunately, a discussion of the timing of FonF is beyond the limits of this chapter. On the one hand, Pienemann (1989) contends that acquisitional orders cannot be altered and that learners cannot be taught a form that belongs to a stage for which they are not cognitively ready. This means we need to identify each learner's stage and modify our teaching strategies accordingly, which is, of course, impractical in the language classroom.

On the other hand, it has been suggested (Lightbown 1998) that learners internalize advanced language. Furthermore, when many different aspects (in the case of the clitics: morphology, syntax, control over forms, agreement across phrases, and so on) are involved, we cannot expect the learner to go from zero to complete control over the rule; developmental stages are bound to appear. The cyclic syllabus is one way of avoiding the problem of catering to different stages of development. Such a syllabus allows the teacher periodically to focus the learner's attention on key, late acquired forms. Different techniques can then be implemented each time, based on the different stages that will be differentially affected.[16]

Conclusion

Focus on Form (FonF) does not mean we are going back to the drill and kill classroom because FonF does not imply constant, indiscriminate grammar explanation and practice. FonF means precisely the opposite: setting limits on what is explicitly taught. This is very clear in the distinction between Focus on Form and Focus on FormS. To the question *what forms to focus on*, the answer is those parts of the language that are difficult to acquire. In the case of Spanish, some of these forms are the subjunctive, *ser* and *estar*, and aspects related to word order, including implicit use of the subject and preverbal clitics. These forms are excellent candidates for a taste of the FonF medicine.

The chapter has argued that teachers need to understand not only *what* forms are late acquired, but also *why* those forms are difficult to acquire and *why* specific types of explicit instruction can help optimize the acquisition of those forms.

The discussion has called for concepts from research areas such as L1 acquisition, SLA, dialectology, sociolinguistics, historical linguistics, and cognitive psychology. Integration into the teacher education curriculum is necessary to help teachers develop language awareness to understand that "grammar is not grammar is not grammar." Language awareness results in better understanding of the nature of SLA processes and the cognitive basis behind the inclusion of FonF techniques in the FL curriculum, such as grammatical explanation and feedback. Development of such awareness should be one of the outcomes of teacher education. It is awareness and understanding that differentiate teacher *education* from teacher *training*.

Notes

1. Focus on FormS "characterizes earlier, synthetic approaches to language teaching that have as their primary organizing principle for course design the accumulation of individual language elements. . . . (It) entails isolation or extraction of linguistic features from context or from communicative activity" (Doughty and Williams 1998, p. 3).
2. I am referring to teachers of Spanish to nonnative speakers in institutions of higher education in the United States.
3. For an interesting discussion, see Hulstijn and De Graaff (1994).

4. Slobin and Bever's crosslinguistic study chose Italian children, not Spanish-speaking children, and full NPs as constituents.
5. The data originate in the Georgetown University's FLIRT (Foreign Language Initiatives in Research and Teaching) database, available at http://www.georgetown.edu/departments/linguistics/flirt/.
6. Some linguists would agree that the Catalan clitic system is even more complex due to many phonological processes involved in its production.
7. María José González, personal communication, in discussing her own dissertation research on focalization in the Spanish spoken in the Basque country, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
8. A number of participants in the experiment went so far as to write the paragraph as if it were a recipe, a type of text that allows repetition of elements already introduced in the discourse.
9. In these experiments, performance in grammaticality judgment tasks of two groups is compared. Participants in the intrinsic group are exposed to input and are asked to memorize input. Sometimes they do not receive any instructions at all. The extrinsic group is exposed to the same input and asked to come up with rules.
10. Only exceptions, such as *gran hombre/hombre grande*, are actually taught at advanced levels.
11. Processing instruction is considered to be obtrusive because it combines manipulated input to provide positive evidence with practice, feedback, and negative evidence in the form of an explanation of what *not* to do when processing Spanish OV sentences. However, the key characteristic of processing instruction is that it engages the students in processing for meaning.
12. It is the result of a process known as *semantic bleaching*, that is, the loss of lexical meaning and the consequent grammaticalization of one of the elements in the opposition (Silva-Corvalán 1986).
13. Sankoff and Thibault (1977) observe the same tendency in Canadian French.
14. Sanz (1990) provides a description of the acquisition of Spanish copula by native speakers of Quechua in a naturalistic context.
15. Textbook authors have attempted to introduce *ser* and *estar* following the "rule explanation + output practice" model. Avoiding a Focus on

FormS approach to the teaching of these forms, Cheng (1995) has designed an alternative way of explicitly introducing the Spanish copula in the classroom with promising results. Her dissertation study shows the positive effect of processing instruction in the acquisition of the *ser/estar* distinction.

16. For interesting evidence on the effects of input enhancement on the different stages of acquisition of the Spanish preterit/imperfect distinction, see Jourdenais (1998).

Works Cited

Andersen, Roger W. 1989. Models, Processes, Principles, and Strategies: Second Language Acquisition Inside and Outside the Classroom. In *Second Language Acquisition/Foreign Language Learning*, edited by B. VanPatten and J.F. Lee, 45–68. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bates, Elizabeth. 1976. *Language and Context.* London: Academic Press.

Bello, Andrés. [1860] 1970. *Gramática de la lengua castellana.* Buenos Aires: Sopena.

Bull, William. 1965. *Spanish for Teachers.* New York: Ronald Press.

Carreiras, Manuel, Alan Garnham, and Jane Oakhill. 1996. Understanding Anaphora: The Role of Superficial and Conceptual Information. In *Language Processing in Spanish*, edited by Manuel Carreiras, José E. García-Albea, and Núria Sebastián-Gallés, 241–274. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cheng, An-Chung. 1995. Grammar Instruction and Input Processing: The Acquisition of Spanish *ser* and *estar.* Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

DeKeyser, Robert M. 1998. Beyond Focus on Form: Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing a Second Language Grammar. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 42–63. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press.

DeKeyser, Robert, and Karl J. Sokalski. 1996. The Differential Role of Comprehension and Production Practice. *Language Learning* 46(4): 613–642.

Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams, eds. 1998. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press.

Falk, Johan. 1979. *SER y ESTAR con atributos adjetivales. Anotaciones sobre el empleo de la cópula en catalán y en castellano.* Stockholm: Almqvist Wiksel International.

Hernández Pina, Fuensanta. 1984. *Teorías psicosociolingüísticas y su aplicación a la adquisición del español como lengua materna.* Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Hulstijn, Jan. 1995. Not All Grammar Rules Are Equal: Giving Grammar Instruction Its Proper Place in Foreign Language Teaching. In *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Teaching,* edited by R. Schmidt, 359–386. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hulstijn, Jan, and Rick De Graaff. 1994. Under What Conditions Does Explicit Knowledge of a Second Language Facilitate the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge? In *Consciousness in Second Language Learning,* edited by J. Hulstijn and R. Schmidt, 359–386. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Jourdenais, Renée. 1998. The Effects of Textual Enhancement on the Acquisition of the Spanish Preterit and Imperfect. Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University.

Klein-Andreu, Flora. 1981. Distintos sistemas de empleo de *le, la, lo*: perspectiva sincrónica, diacrónica, y sociolingüística. *Thesaurus* 36: 284–297.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1968. Sobre los orígenes y evolución del leísmo, laísmo y loísmo. In *Festschrift Walther von Wartburg zum 80. Geburtstag,* edited by Kurt Baldinger, vol. 1: 523–551. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Lightbown, Patsy M. 1998. The Importance of Timing in Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Catherine Doughty and J. Williams, 177–196. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

LoCoco, Veronica L. 1987. Learner Comprehension of Oral and Written Sentences in German and Spanish: The Importance of Word Order. In *Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective,* edited by Bill VanPatten, T. R. Dvorak, and F. J. Lee, 61–75. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Long, Michael H. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective,* edited by K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch, 39–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

López-Ornat, Susana. 1994. *La adquisición de la lengua española.* Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Luján, Marta. 1981. Spanish Copulas as Aspectual Indicators. *Lingua* 54: 165–209.

Ortega, L., and Michael H. Long. 1997. Vocabulary Enhancement Activities and Reading for Meaning in Second Language Vocabulary. In *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition,* edited by J. Coady and T. Huckin, 174–200. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, Anne M. 1985. Language Segmentation: Operating Principles for the Perception and Analysis of Language. In *The Cross-Linguistic Study of Language Acquisition: Theoretical Issues,* edited by D. I. Slobin, vol. 2: 1029–1067. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pienemann, Manfred. 1984. Psychological Constraints on the Teachability of Languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 6: 186–214.

______. 1989. Is Language Teachable? *Applied Linguistics* 10(1): 52–79.

Robinson, Peter. 1996. Learning Simple and Complex Second Language Rules under Implicit, Incidental, Rule-Search, and Instructed Conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 27–68.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 1997. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 53(2): 422–451.

Sankoff, Gillian, and Pierrette Thibault. 1977. L'alternance entre les auxiliaires *avoir* et *être* en français parlé à Montréal. *Langue Française* 34: 81–109.

Santilli, M. 1996. Teacher Talk as Input to Second Language Acquisition of Spanish. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Sanz, Cristina. 1990. La adquisición de "*ser* y *estar* + adjetivo" por los bilingües que tienen el quechua como primera lengua. Unpublished manuscript. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

______. 1994. *Task, Mode, and the Effects of Input-Based Explicit Instruction.* Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

______. 1996. Killing Two Birds with One Stone: A Study on the Spread of Knowledge in Catalan. *EuroSLA* 6, May 30–June 2, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

______. 1998. Spanish Teacher Talk: General Characteristics and Word Order in Particular. Second Language Research Forum '98, October 15–18, Honolulu, HI.

Sanz, Cristina, and Martha Bigelow. 1998. Word Order in Spanish L2 Production: Oral and Written Stories beyond the Early Intermediate Level. In *Profiling the Advanced Instructed Learner: Initial Findings from a Cross-Linguistic Research Project,* colloquium organized at the American Association for Applied Linguistics Meeting, March 14, Seattle, WA.

Sanz, Cristina, and María José González. 1995. *Ser* and *estar* in Tortosí Catalan: Language Use, Language Variation, and Language Change. *Sintagma* 7: 5–25.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1986. Bilingualism and Language Change: The Extension of *estar* in Los Angeles Spanish. *Language* 62: 587–608.

______. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles.* Clarendon, NY: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, Peter. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning.* Clarendon, NY: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, Dan, and Thomas G. Bever. 1982. Children Use Canonical Sentence Schemes: A Crosslinguistic Study of Word Order and Inflections. *Cognition* 12 (3): 229–265.

Swain, Merrill. 1984. A Review of Immersion Education in Canada: Research and Evaluation Studies. In *Language Issues and Education Policies,* edited by P. Allen and M. Swain, 35–52. California State Department of Education.

VanPatten, Bill. 1984. Learners' Comprehension of Clitic Pronouns: More Evidence for a Word Order Strategy. *Hispanic Linguistics* 1: 57–67.

______. 1987. Classroom Learners' Acquisition of *ser* and *estar*: Accounting for Developmental Patterns. In *Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective,* edited by B. VanPatten, T. R. Dvorak, and J. F. Lee, 61–75. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

______. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

VanPatten, Bill, and Teresa Cadierno. 1993. Explicit Instruction and Input Processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 225–244.

VanPatten, Bill, and Cristina Sanz. 1995. From Input to Output: Processing Instruction and Communicative Tasks. In *Second Language*

Acquisition Theory and Pedagogy, edited by F. Eckman, 169–186. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

VanPatten, Bill, James F. Lee, and Terry Ballman. 1996. *¿Sabías que...? Beginning Spanish*. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

FIVE TYPES OF INPUT AND THE VARIOUS RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FORM AND MEANING

James F. Lee
Indiana University

The purpose of this paper is to offer a perspective on how the term *input* has been and is used in second language acquisition. To that end, five types of input are identified: comprehensible input, simplified input, enhanced input, interactionally modified input, and structured input. As part of explicating what each of these types of input entails, I will also pay particular attention to establishing the relationship between form and meaning that is associated with each type of input. The relationship ranges from disassociated (one has nothing to do with the other) to inextricably linked (one is the means by which to access the other). I also address classroom concerns.

Introduction: Form and Meaning

What happens when a second language learner of Spanish encounters the following sentence in a passage about the Panamanian singer, actor, and activist, Rubén Blades?

> ***Text.*** *El mismo admitió esto diciéndome, "Mi música y mis inquietudes son lo primero pero, el cine es un medio que cada día me interesa más."*
>
> ***Translation.*** He himself admitted this, saying to me, "My music and my political concerns come first, but film is a medium that every day interests me more."

The learner, of course, attempts to make sense of the message, that is, the informational content. The author of the passage has a meaning he wishes to convey, and the task of the reader is to extract that meaning, to interpret the author's message. The following interpretation is that of a first year learner of Spanish who was engaged in a think-aloud procedure. (This research is reported fully in Lee 1999.) As he encountered the sentence, he stated the following:

> *Interpretation.* (M1) The same admits this. I don't know. He admits the same. And "mi música" . . . but the film is a media that. I don't know. I guess it says he likes film better.

The learner's interpretation of the informational content demonstrates the use of various reading strategies generally considered to be good strategies for dealing with text. He skipped unknown words such as "*esto diciéndome*" and "*mis inquietudes son lo primero,*" but he did not ignore them. He marked their place in the sentence with "I don't know," a metacognitive indication that he was aware of his lack of comprehension. The learners stumbled on the initial phrase, "*El mismo admitió,*" as evidenced by his switching the order of the constituents. The learner is attempting to make sense of the words. In his lexicon he apparently has only one meaning to assign to "*mismo,*" that of *same*, which is one meaning, but, in this case, not the correct one. He seemed to assess his lack of comprehension and move on, concentrating his effort on the more important information given in the quote. The learner's comprehension is neither complete nor exact. It is, however, somewhat accurate to interpret that Rubén Blades likes films. This example serves to underscore how readers create meaning from what they read.

The reading passage also provides the learner input for his developing second-language linguistic system. Not only does the learner make meaning from the informational content, he also has the potential to make form/meaning connections, that is, to process the linguistic data. In other words, the input has a meaning to interpret and that meaning is expressed via formal features of the second language. From an input processing perspective, the example is extremely problematic. The learner rendered the target verb, "*admitió,*" in the present tense both times he uttered the word. He did not map a past-tense meaning onto the orthographically marked final vowel. The learner also struggled with the word "*mismo,*" which can mean either *same* or *self.* The learner assigned the semantic meaning of *same* and then shifted the word syntactically to object position in English. He did not use the word order in the passage to alter the semantic meaning he assigned to "*mismo.*"

The next example, however, demonstrates how learners can process the input for meaning and for form. This second language learner struggled to interpret the verb and in doing so used many different knowledge sources, both textual and extratextual. The following example demonstrates a strong, ongoing interplay of form and meaning:

> ***Text.*** *En la década pasada, actuó en varias películas, como por ejemplo,* Crossover Dream *y* The Milagro Beanfield War.
>
> ***Translation.*** In the past decade, he acted in various films, for example, *Crossover Dream* and *The Milagro Beanfield War.*
>
> ***Interpretation.*** (Y1) So, in the decade past, actually in various films. I don't think that's "actually," but it looks like "actually," so that's why I guessed that. Um, maybe it's act. Act in various films, like the example *Crossover Dream* and *The Milagro Beanfield War.* So that just speaks of like if you know the context of the paragraph, you can follow along and probably guess that, that, uh, it's talking about how he worked on the different.

At this point the researcher asked the learner why he thought "actually" was incorrect. He stated the following:

> Um, well, "actually" wouldn't be like the word to fit in there. Well, at least to me it wouldn't because it wouldn't make sense to say "actually" in various films. Um, he, he acted in various films. And, also, we just learned the past tense like last night. And it looks like the past tense, *actuó*. I don't know. Good guess at least.

This learner's use of formal features of language is rather strong. His initial rendering of "actually" for "*actuó*" is based in an orthographic similarity between the words. He immediately rejects his interpretation because of the lack of syntactic fit between the words; he rendered an adverb in front of a prepositional phrase. Finally, he refers to the morphological ending on the verb.

The relationship between form and meaning as expressed in this introduction is a rather contemporary view. The meaning in the input is encoded linguistically; input contains forms. Learners must construct meaning and construct a second-language linguistic system. Input is the key to both. In the remainder of this paper I will examine how the term *input* has been and is used in second-language acquisition. I will pay particular attention to the relationship between form and meaning underlying the various uses of the term.

Five Types of Input

Comprehensible Input

It was only a decade and a half ago that the term "comprehensible input" ignited researchers and teachers alike. The term fueled much discussion and, eventually, a great debate whether comprehensible input caused language acquisition to take place. It helped usher in the "Natural Approach" to language teaching (Krashen and Terrell 1983) with its emphasis on teachers' use of the target language and the ways in which to make themselves understood: linguistically, paralinguistically, as well as through various activity types. The Natural Approach also emphasized an emotionally positive classroom environment. As indicated in the following quote, a learner's emotional state (referred to as an *affective filter*) was said to hinder or promote language development:

> *People acquire second languages only if they obtain comprehensible input and if their affective filters are low enough to let the input "in." When the filter is "down" and appropriate comprehensible input is presented (and comprehended), acquisition is inevitable" (Krashen 1985, p. 4).*
>
> *In other words, ". . . the true causative variables in second language acquisition derive from the input hypothesis and the affective filter—the amount of comprehensible input the acquirer receives and understands, and the strength of the affective filter, or the degree to which the acquirer is "open" to the input (Krashen 1982, p. 9).*

What is appropriate comprehensible input? Answering this question leads to another term that ignited researchers and teachers, $i + 1$, where i represents current competence and $i + 1$ the next stage of competence. With $i + 1$, the input is made useful to the acquirer for language development. More important, the input need not contain only $i + 1$; ". . . if the acquirer understands the input, and there is enough of it, $i + 1$ will automatically be provided. In other words, if communication is successful, $i + 1$ is provided. . . . This implies that the best input should not even attempt to deliberately aim at $i + 1$" (Krashen 1982, p. 21). Roughly tuned input will provide $i + 1$. An instructor would not want to seed or otherwise privilege the input with particular forms and structures. Rather, the "speaker 'casts a net' of structure around your current level, your i" (Krashen and Terrell 1983, p. 33).

Krashen and Terrell (1983) provide the following example of comprehensible input. (Italics represent instructor's speech to learners.)

> ... another technique is to describe several pictures, asking the students to point to the picture being described:
>
> **Picture 1.** *There are several people in this picture. One appears to be a father, the other a daughter. What are they doing. Cooking. They are cooking a hamburger.*
>
> **Picture 2.** *There are two men in this picture. They are young. They are boxing.*
>
> In all these activities, the instructor attempts to maintain a constant flow of comprehensible input. The students will be successful if the instructor maintains their attention on the key lexical items, uses appropriate gestures, and uses context to help them understand. If the students are literate, writing the key words on the chalkboard will give a visual image for key lexical items and draw students' attention to the content words.
>
> The comprehensibility of input will be increased if the instructor uses repetition and paraphrase: *There are two men in this picture. Two. One, two* (counting). *They are young. There are two young men. At least I think they are young. Do you think that they are young? Are the two men young? Or old? Do you think that they are young or old?* The instructor can weave these repetitions naturally into discourse so that they do not sound like repetitions. Nor is there need to pause at each potential question point for an answer, since each question is usually paraphrased in two or three ways before the instructor expects a response (Krashen and Terrell 1983, p. 77).

Clearly, Krashen and Terrell emphasize comprehension of meaning and the role lexical items play in that. What was always problematic to account for was the specific linguistic characteristics of roughly tuned input or what linguistic structures would be appropriate for a learner's next level of competence.

VanPatten (1991) also provides an example of an activity designed to provide learners initial input (their first exposure). By way of introduction, he states

> *Since the learner's job at this point is to process input and get language, it seems more appropriate that communication on the part of the learner at this stage involve more of an* interpretation *of language. It is the instructor, the materials, reading texts, and other target sources of language that* express *most of the meaning in the earliest stages. Appropriate communicatively based activities, then, involve having the learners actively process and interpret language they hear and see (VanPatten 1991, p. 58, emphasis original).*

To illustrate these points, VanPatten provides an activity in which the instructor describes his family. The activity takes place the first day of a first semester foreign language class. Even though the sample scenario is given in English, it is supposed to be delivered completely in the target language. The instructor would have prepared visuals and overheads prior to the class. The instructor's speech is made comprehensible through the use of visuals, gestures, repetition, and thoughtfully structuring the presentation of information into segments (nuclear family versus extended family). The instructor occasionally pauses to check learners' comprehension. The learners' involvement in the activity is encouraged through comprehension checks, showing visuals in such a way as to reveal the family tree slowly, and provide learners real information about real people. (Instructor's speech is italicized.)

> *Activity 1* (providing initial input)
>
> *Today we are going to talk about my family. I have a most interesting family* (displays "My Family" on board or overhead). *Here am I. These are my parents. This is my father, and this is my mother. Father . . . mother. My father's name is Bill. My mother's name is Juanita. They are divorced. This is my stepfather, Joe. My stepfather. And this is my sister . . . my only sister. Her name is Gloria* (turns off overhead or covers visual).
>
> *Let's see what kind of memory you have. What is my father's name—Joe or Bill?* (responses) *What is my mother's name—Juanita or Gloria?* (responses) *Right. Gloria is my sister, not my mother. And do I have any brothers?* (responses) *No* (shows visual again). *All right, to summarize, my family consists of my father, Bill, my mother, Juanita, and my sister, Gloria. I have no brothers. Oh, I also have a stepfather, Joe. My parents have been divorced since 1972* (writes date on board). *Now, that was easy,*

> *but here are some other family members* (now reveals grandparents) (VanPatten 1991, p. 59).

For many, it was easier to understand the relationship between comprehensible input and vocabulary acquisition than it was to understand the relationship between comprehensible input and grammar acquisition. The difficulties researchers and teachers had with this theory was determining what learners' current level of competence was, their *i*, as well as determining what would be the next level, their *i* + 1. The lack of specificity of the linguistic characteristics of *i* and *i* + 1 concerned many and deeply bothered others. Krashen appealed to a Chomskian notion of a language acquisition device in the brain while teachers and researchers (at that time) were heavily influenced by the psychology of learning, that is, specific cognitive mechanisms for learning information. A common misconception was that instructors talked *at* learners, not *with* them.

Krashen's Input Hypothesis clearly disassociated form from meaning. To move from one stage of acquisition to another requires that "the acquirer understand input that contains *i* + 1, where "understand means that the acquirer is focussed on the meaning and not the form of the message" (Krashen 1982, p. 21). ". . . Language acquisition can only take place when a message which is being transmitted is understood, i.e., when the focus is on *what* is being said rather than on the form of the message" (Krashen and Terrell 1983, p. 55, emphasis original). Krashen advocated against an explicit focus on form. He did not see form as a way to get meaning. Rather, he saw meaning as a way to get form.

Simplified Input

Closely linked to the notion of comprehensible input is simplified input. Input can be made more comprehensible in a variety of ways including repetition, gestures, and the use of visuals. Input can also be made more comprehensible through linguistic modifications in the speaker's speech. The key question to understanding simplified input is, What do speakers do linguistically to make themselves understood? When caretakers speak to children (i.e., motherese or caretaker speech), when native speakers speak to nonnative speakers (i.e., foreigner talk), when language instructors speak to language learners (i.e., teacher talk), they naturally, either consciously or unconsciously, simplify their speech in order to increase or ensure the success of the communicative exchange. In other words, given a linguistic imbalance between interlocutors, the more proficient speaker linguistically modifies his or her speech. These linguistic modifications include speaking more slowly and loudly and articulating phonology. These modifications also include stressing key words, using high frequency vocabulary, using fewer pronouns, selecting simple syntax, creating shorter sentences, and giving learners a choice of responses within a posed question (Hatch 1983).

Simplified input, as a research construct, was examined unidirectionally; speech flowed from speaker to hearer but not vice versa. (*Directionality* is the critical difference between simplified input and modified input.) Learners were exposed to prepackaged input, that is, simplified versus nonsimplified input, and then their comprehension was tested. The learner was not in a position to interact with the speaker; they could only interpret the incoming message but not negotiate their understanding with the speaker. Subjects listened to minilectures (Chaudron and Richards 1986) or heard passages (Leow 1995). By focusing on comprehension effects rather than on language learning, this line of research ignored form and implicitly dichotomized form and meaning. The research only examined meaning but not the relationship between specific forms and creating meaning from them.

Certain speech events are characterized by unidirectional delivery of speech. Listening to the radio or television does not allow the listener to interact with the speaker. In the academic context, the large lecture class is often unidirectional. The approach and methodology used to examine simplified input has ecological validity; listeners often do not have the opportunity to negotiate meaning with a speaker. But what happens when two or more speakers interact with each other and, in a dynamic way, create and negotiate meaning?

Enhanced Input

Enhanced input is a type of input supplied during face-to-face interactions (i.e., conversations) between speakers (as opposed to premodified, simplified input). Language learners actively participate in communicative exchanges with other language learners, native speakers, or simply more proficient second-language speakers. During these exchanges native speakers and more proficient speakers often rephrase, recast, and expand on what learners say to them. These expansions often provide learners a more accurate model of the target language and also confirm to the learner that the other speaker has comprehended the message (although comprehension is not at stake). I use the term "enhanced input" to refer to situations in which the interlocutors are comprehending each other, but the more proficient speaker expands on what the less proficient speaker has said. Through their interaction, a speaker provides enhanced input to a listener. The key question to understanding enhanced input is, How do speakers respond to each other?

The following exchange, from Lightbown and Spada (1993), shows how a child acquiring his native language is given a correct adultlike model of a past tense verb form when the adult recasts the child's utterance. The adult enhances her input to the child by providing a more accurate target form. In this instance, the child actually incorporates elements of this enhanced input into his own speech.

Peter (24 months), Lois (adult), Patsy (adult)

1. **Patsy:** What happened to it [the truck]?
2. **Peter:** (looking under the chair for it) Lose it. Dump truck! Dump truck! Fall! Fall!
3. **Lois:** Yes, the dump truck fell down.
4. **Peter:** Dump truck fell down. Dump truck.

(*Source:* Lightbown and Spada 1993, p. 3)

In the example, the speakers obviously comprehend each other. The adult correctly interpreted "Dump truck! Fall!" She provides the child another way of saying his message, "The dump truck fell down." The child then produces the more adultlike form.

The second interaction shows how an instructor responds to the content of messages when comprehension is not in question. The instructor understood the messages offered by the learners but chose to expand and comment on them, offering them more input.

1. **Instructor:** I have one more question. Do you believe, and I want to see hands, do you believe that a person can be bilingual without being bicultural? That is, a person can speak two languages, but the person does not have two cultures. How many believe it is true? [learners raise hands] Many, many. Why do you believe this?
2. **Learner 1:** A person studies the language in his own country but not go to another country.
3. **Instructor:** That's it. If someone studies the language without having contact with the culture. It seems to me that the

person would be bilingual without being bicultural. Uh huh. Other reasons?

4. **Learner 2:** Someone can learn only the language in his school, school, and not have someone culture than the language.
5. **Instructor:** If you do not have contact with people who represent the culture and if you only have contact in school, yes, this can be the result.

(*Source:* Adapted from Lee 2000, p. 64.)

The following exchange took place in a beginning ESL class at the secondary level. The instructor maintains and supports the interaction by expanding on the learners' utterances. The result is that not only does the conversation keep moving forward, but the learners receive a grammatically correct representation of what they intended to express.

1. **Instructor**: Vin, have you ever been to the movies? What's your favorite movie?
2. **Vin**: *Big.*
3. **Instructor**: *Big*, OK, that's a good movie; that was about a little boy inside a big man, wasn't it?
4. **Vin**: Yeah, boy get surprise all the time.
5. **Instructor**: Yes, he was surprised, wasn't he? Usually little boys don't do the things that men do, do they?
6. **Vin**: No, little boy no drink.
7. **Instructor**: That's right, little boys don't drink.

(*Source:* Adapted from Johnson 1995, pp. 23–24.)

Enhanced input is the result of a more proficient speaker accepting a language learner's intended message but then recasting it in a more formally correct way. The more proficient speaker is linking form and meaning in his enhanced input. The meaning, however, is not his own but that of his interlocutors.

Interactionally Modified Input

The research on conversational adjustments, or the negotiation of meaning, has tended to focus on communication breakdowns. Negotiation has been rather narrowly characterized as "those interactions in which learners and their interlocutors adjust their speech phonologically, lexically, and morphosyntactically to resolve difficulties in mutual understanding that impede the course of their communication . . . Negotiation was defined as an activity that occurs when a listener signals to a speaker that the speaker's message is not clear, and listener and speaker modify their speech to resolve this impasse" (Pica 1992, p. 200).

Conversation seems to provide an architectural framework through which language learners can negotiate meaning and get linguistic forms and structures. In her recent book, Gass elaborates on this point. Within the input-interaction perspective, "the input to the learner, coupled with the learner's manipulation of the input through interaction forms a basis of language development. With regard to input, there are two aspects to consider, the functions of simplified input in terms of language learning and the relation between simplifying speech and comprehension . . . It is a given that without understanding, no learning can take place. Although understanding alone does not guarantee learning, it does set the scene for potential learning . . . Through negotiation of meaning [i.e., interaction], learners gain additional information about the language and focus their attention on particular parts of the language. This attention primes language for integration into a developing interlinguistic system" (Gass 1997, pp. 86–87).

The relationship between form and meaning is not dichotomized since it is one person's need to express meaning and another person's difficulty with interpreting that meaning that leads to a focus on form and the potential learning of that form. *Potential* is a key concept to consider. There are many processes involved in language acquisition: comprehension of the form, intake of the form, and incorporation of the form into the developing linguistic system. The research on negotiation of meaning makes an assumption that Lightbown and Spada (1993) clearly point out. The assumption is based on a logical relationship, rather than an empirically demonstrated one, between interactional modification and acquisition. "1. Interactional modification makes input comprehensible. 2. Comprehensible input promotes acquisition. *Therefore,* 3. Interactional modification promotes acquisition" (Lightbown and Spada 1993, p. 30, emphasis mine). The relationship between interactional modification and acquisition is mediated by the relationship between comprehensible input and acquisition.

Structured Input

Comprehensible input, simplified input, enhanced input, and interactionally modified input do not focus on predetermined forms. Rather, discussions of comprehensible and simplified input usually refer to forms in the input in the most general way. Enhanced input and interactionally modified input result in attention to form, but not necessarily to specific forms. Structured input, by way of contrast, focuses on very particular forms and, as such, is a type of grammar instruction referred to as "processing instruction."

Krashen's views on the Input Hypothesis and the pedagogical fallout caused much discussion and debate concerning the role of explicit grammar instruction in language teaching. Positions ranged from "you-don't-need-to-teach-grammar-explicitly-just-provide-comprehensible-input" to "you-must-focus-on-linguistic-accuracy-from-the-beginning-of-instruction" (Omaggio Hadley 1993). VanPatten maintained that the question was not whether to teach grammar but how to teach it (VanPatten 1988). We can add that the question is not only how to teach grammar but when to teach it and what grammar to teach (Lee 1998). Partial answers to these questions are to teach some grammar via structured input and its counterpart, structured output (Lee and VanPatten 1995; VanPatten 1996). Let me focus here, though, on structured input.

In order to arrive at his ideas regarding structured input, VanPatten worked closely with issues surrounding the relationship between form and meaning. His principles of input processing address that relationship from a psycholinguistic perspective (VanPatten 1996). What is clear from research is that language learners "go for" meaning before they "go for" form. That is, when engaged in communicative exchanges where message transmission and reception are the goal of and purpose for interacting, learners find ways to comprehend. They may not, however, find ways to link what they comprehend (the meaning they extract) with the formal properties of language that encoded that meaning. From a language acquisition perspective, if learners are not linking form and meaning, they are not acquiring language. The potential for language development has been missed.

What to do in order to push learners to make these desired links and connections? The answer is, align their attention on forms such that processing the form for meaning would be the only way to comprehend the input. (In its elaborated form, VanPatten [1996] refers to this as processing instruction.) Consider the following examples. There are two "formal" differences between sentences 1 and 2.

1. *Hablo esta tarde con el profesor.*
2. *Habló ayer con el profesor.*

First, the verb forms, while graphemically similar, differ in the placement of stress, which is orthographically indicated in 2 as falling on the final syllable. Stress falls on the penultimate syllable in 1. The difference in stress results in a difference in tense (present to past) and person (first to third). Stress is, then, a rather meaningful difference when trying to comprehend the messages of these two sentences. The other difference is the choice of temporal adverbial. These adverbials clearly indicate the time frame and in doing so give some of the same information as the verb endings do. Research indicates that learners tend to ignore the verb endings when interpreting time frame if lexical adverbs are also present in the input. In a sense, the information supplied by lexical adverbs overrides the information supplied by verbal morphemes.

In order to structure input to push learners to use forms to interpret the input, VanPatten "stripped" off everything that could pull or lure learners' attention away from form. So, learners would be presented input sentences and asked to assign a temporal reference. For example, they would hear sentences 3 and 4 and select the temporal adverbial that would complete the meaning. The only way to do so correctly is to listen for the verb endings. That is, in order to process for meaning the learners must process the forms.

3. Hablo con el profesor.
a. esta tarde b. ayer

4. Habló con el profesor.
a. esta tarde b. ayer

The way language learners should listen to Spanish is different from the way they should listen to other languages such as English. The Spanish language is rich in verb-final inflections that provide information on tense, aspect, mood, person, and number. A native speaker of English, for example, is not accustomed to listening to verb endings for this kind of information or this quantity of information. Processing instruction is a means by which to train the nonnative ear to perceive and utilize the target forms during on-line comprehension.

As Blyth (1998), Garrett (1986), and VanPatten (1996) have pointed out, not all grammar is created equal, and certainly one question that faces instructors is what grammar should be taught. The forms that have been empirically examined for structured input all have referential meaning; the forms are not redundant in the structured input sentences in which they have been presented. Research on processing instruction has examined preterit tense verb morphology (Cadierno 1995), the syntax of object pronouns (VanPatten and Cadierno 1993; VanPatten and Sanz 1995), and the lexical semantics of the Spanish copular system (Cheng 1995). It has searched out sentence-level versus discourse-level task effects (VanPatten and Sanz 1995). It has determined whether explanation or practice is more important to learner development (VanPatten and Oikkenon 1996). As VanPatten states,

> *the effects of processing instruction are consistently observable. Not only do learners receiving processing instruction gain in the ability to process input better, but also their developing system is affected such that they can access the targeted linguistic features when making output. This is the case with a variety of linguistic items, and in the VanPatten and Sanz study we saw that the effects of processing instruction extend to a variety of output tasks. In addition, the findings of VanPatten and Oikkenon suggest that learners' engagement in structured input activities within processing instruction is the most significant variable; explicit information (explanation) does not appear to be critical (VanPatten 1996, p. 127).*

Structured input and processing instruction make a direct link between form and meaning. By being exposed to structured input and being taught how to process the form in input, learners begin the process of making form-meaning connections. This direct association was missing in previous discussions of comprehensible and simplified input. While the link between form and meaning was made with interactionally modified input, the link was not to specific forms as it is with structured input.

Classroom Concerns

Input is the critical element in language development, but language classrooms, especially foreign language classrooms, have often been described as input-impoverished. The input that learners are exposed to is limited in both quantity and quality. The need for input is undeniable as is the need for instructors to make themselves understood to language learners for, as Gass (1997) indicated, there is no learning without understanding (i.e., comprehension of the message in the input). Processing instruction with its recommendations for structuring input represents an important step forward in classroom language learning. When we understand what learners do with input, what they do to understand the meaning of what they hear or read, we can then intervene and help shape the processes. We want learners to make more and better form-meaning mappings. We want them to understand the messages directed to them, and we want them, as a result of understanding these messages, to get more language.

Krashen and Terrell's (1983) various recommendations for supplying learners with comprehensible input are still valid. Many instructors can make themselves understood by linguistically simplifying their speech; they naturally use teacher talk when addressing language learners. They naturally modify their speech to learners when, during interaction, learners signal a lack of comprehension or misinterpretation. The research on interactional modifications has helped underscore the importance of negotiation in language teaching. As explained in Lee (2000), the reasons for emphasizing negotiation vary. First, we have an interactionist theory of language acquisition that accounts for aspects of both first- and second-language acquisition (see Lightbown and Spada 1993 for an explanation of various theories of language acquisition). We also know that input alone is insufficient for complete language development. The roles of output are to push learners to develop communicative language ability (Lee and VanPatten 1995) as well as to help learners become better processors of input (Swain 1985). Classroom research comparing various activity types shows a connection between negotiation and particular linguistic structures said to promote language development (e.g., Rulon and McCreary 1986). And, finally, many researchers and instructors have adopted a social view of communication that emphasizes the interpersonal, dynamic, and context-specific nature of communication (e.g., Kinginger 1996; Brooks, Donato, and McGlone 1997) and deemphasizes any justification based on analyzing linguistic elements of speech. The pedagogical fallout has been to rethink classroom practices in order to privilege the negotiation of meaning. Learners are given communicative tasks that require them to exchange information.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to examine various types of input: comprehensible input, simplified input, enhanced input, interactionally modified input, and structured input. Each of these types of input entails a particular relationship between form and meaning. When engaged in communicative exchanges, language learners make meaning from the propositional content of messages. Language learners must also make form-meaning connections; they must use the linguistic data in the input to construct a linguistic system.

At one end of the spectrum, we find types of input that disassociated the relationship between form and meaning. Comprehensible input and simplified input in essence claim that, through making meaning, learners would naturally make form-meaning connections. The forms in question would be whichever forms happened to be in the input. As long as the learner understood meaning, the forms would follow. Enhanced input and interactionally modified input underscore the importance of verbal interactions in language acquisition. Interlocutors will provide learners the correct form with which they should have expressed their meanings. At other times, when learners need to make meaning they will negotiate it. Forms will emerge during the negotiation as speakers modify their speech. In doing so, learners make form-meaning connections. The forms in question would be whichever forms happened to emerge during the interaction. Interaction is the mechanism that draws attention to forms. At the other end of the spectrum, structured input inextricably links very particular forms with the meanings they encode. Input is structured in such a way that learners must process particular forms in the input in order to make meaning from the input sentences. Form and meaning are thereby linked. In the case of structured input, the overlap between comprehension and input processing is total.

Works Cited

Blyth, Carl S. 1998. A Position Statement on the Teaching of Grammar. Unpublished manuscript produced for the 1998 McGraw-Hill Teleconference, Long Beach, CA.

Brooks, Frank B., Richard Donato, and John V. McGlone. 1997. When Are They Going to Say It Right? Understanding Learner Talk during Pair Work. *Foreign Language Annals* 40: 524–541.

Cadierno, Teresa. 1995. Formal Instruction from a Processing Perspective. *Modern Language Journal* 79: 179–193.

Chaudron, Craig, and Jack Richards. 1986. The Effects of Discourse Markers on the Comprehension of Lectures. *Applied Linguistics* 7: 113–127.

Cheng, An-Chung. 1995. Grammar Instruction and Input Processing: The Acquisition of Spanish *ser* and *estar.* Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Garrett, Nina. 1986. The Problem with Grammar: What Kind Can the Language Learner Use? *Modern Language Journal* 70: 133–147.

Gass, Susan M. 1997. *Input, Interaction and the Second Language Learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hatch, Evelyn M. 1983. Simplified Input and Second Language Acquisition. In *Pidginization and Creolization as Language Acquisition*, edited by Roger W. Andersen, 64–86. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Johnson, Karen E. 1995. *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kinginger, Celeste. 1996. Personal communication.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

______. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications.* New York: Longman.

Krashen, Stephen D., and Tracy D. Terrell. 1983. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom.* Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

Lee, James F. 1998. A Position Statement on the Teaching of Grammar. Unpublished manuscript produced for the 1998 McGraw-Hill Teleconference, Long Beach, CA.

______. 1999. On Levels of Processing and Levels of Comprehension. In *Advances in Hispanic Linguistics: Papers from the 2nd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, edited by J. Gutiérrez-Rexach and F. Martínez-Gil, 42–59. Boston: Cascadilla Press.

______. 2000. *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leow, Ronald P. 1995. Modality and Intake in Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 17: 79–89.

Lightbown, Patsy, and Nina Spada. 1993. *How Languages Are Learned.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Omaggio Hadley, Alice C. 1993. *Language Teaching in Context.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Pica, Teresa. 1992. The Textual Outcomes of Native Speaker–Non-native Speaker Negotiation: What Do They Reveal? In *Text and Context: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch and Sally McConnel-Ginet, 198–237. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Rulon, K. A., and J. McCreary. 1986. Negotiation of Content: Teacher-fronted and Small-group Interaction. In *Talking to Learn*, edited by Richard Day, 182–199. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, Merrill. 1985. Communicative Competence: Some Roles for Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development. In *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Susan M. Gass and Carolyn Madden, 235–253. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

VanPatten, Bill. 1988. How Juries Get Hung: Problems with the Evidence for a Focus on Form. *Language Learning* 38: 243–260.

______. 1991. The Foreign Language Classroom as a Place to Communicate. In *Foreign Language Acquisition Research and the Classroom*, edited by Barbara F. Freed, 54–73. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

______. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction: Theory and Research.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

VanPatten, Bill, and Teresa Cadierno. 1993. Explicit Instruction and Input Processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 225–243.

VanPatten, Bill, and Solei Oikkenon. 1996. The Causative Variables in Processing Instruction: Explanation versus Structured Input Activities. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 495–510.

VanPatten, Bill, and Cristina Sanz. 1995. From Input to Output: Processing Instruction and Communicative Tasks. In *Second Language Acquisition and Pedagogy*, edited by Fred Eckman, P. W. Lee, J. Mileham, and R. R. Weber, 169–185. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

PROCESSING INSTRUCTION AS FORM-MEANING CONNECTIONS: ISSUES IN THEORY AND RESEARCH

Bill VanPatten
The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Of recent interest in SLA literature is input processing. Input processing (IP) involves learner attention to form during on-line comprehension. The result of IP is intake, that set of form-meaning connections held in working memory and made available for further processing. The present paper reviews a set of principles related to how learners make form-meaning connections during IP and reconstructs the argument for the role of structured input in classroom SLA and the value of pushing learners' interpretation strategies in addition to their productive (expressive) strategies. The paper also addresses criticisms and misunderstandings of the role of structured input in instructed SLA and shows how certain positions on the role of output in classroom SLA are misinterpretations of the role of output in general SLA theory.

Introduction

Without a doubt, input has come to play a central role in second-language acquisition (SLA) theory since the mid-70s.[1] Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) perhaps state it best when they say that "All cases of successful first- and second-language acquisition are characterized by the availability of comprehensible input" (p. 142). Whether one investigates SLA using UG, the Competition Model, connectionism, information processing, or some other framework, it is either assumed or stated that the basic data learners have for building some kind of mental representation of language is the input they are exposed to. It is also assumed or stated that the minimal characteristics of this input are that (1) it is meaning-bearing (i.e., encodes a message that is intended for the learner to capture) and (2) it is somehow comprehensible.

Although input now occupies a fundamental role in SLA, only recently has input processing emerged as an aspect of SLA deserving of scholarly attention (VanPatten 1995, 1996). It is common knowledge in SLA circles that not all of input becomes intake; if this were true, acquisition might well be instantaneous. Thus, those working within IP as a field of inquiry ask the fundamental questions "How do learners make form-meaning connections during on-line comprehension?" and "What psycholinguistic strategies or mechanisms guide the processing of input?" If we conceive of the term "intake" as those data that result from some kind of linguistic processing of the input, then input processing is concerned with how learners derive intake from the input.

The purpose of the present paper is three-part. The first is to review the nature of input processing using a model developed in a series of previous publications (VanPatten 1984, 1985, 1990, 1995, 1996). The model will not be reviewed in detail, but particular aspects will receive special attention as we address the question of form-meaning relationships and the development of a linguistic system in the learner's mind. The second is to review a type of focus on form that uses input processing as its theoretical framework. This type of focus on form is called *processing instruction.* The final purpose is to address a set of criticisms directed at processing instruction and to argue that these criticisms, as currently formulated, are invalid.

Theoretical Background: Input Processing

As stated in the introduction, input processing (IP) is concerned with those psycholinguistic strategies and mechanisms by which learners derive intake from input. As such, IP attempts to explain how learners get form from input while their primary attention is on meaning. *Form* is defined as "surface features of language" (e.g., functors, inflections), although IP is also relevant to syntax (i.e., sentential word order). In VanPatten (1996) the most complete model of IP is presented. This model consists of a set of principles and corollaries that interact in complex ways in working memory. It is important to point out the role of working memory in this model since the first two principles are predicated on a limited capacity for processing information. Learners can do only so

Table 1
Principles of Input Processing

P1. Learners process input for meaning before they process it for form.
  P1a. Learners process content words in the input before anything else.
  P1b. Learners prefer processing lexical items to grammatical items (e.g., morphology) for the same semantic information.
  P1c. Learners prefer processing "more meaningful" morphology before "less" or "nonmeaningful" morphology.

P2. For learners to process form that is not meaningful, they must be able to process informational or communicative content at no (or little) cost to attention.

P3. Learners possess a default strategy that assigns the role of agent (or subject) to the first noun (phrase) they encounter in a sentence/utterance. This is called the first noun strategy.
  P3a. The first noun strategy may be overridden by lexical semantics and event probabilities.
  P3b. Learners will adopt other processing strategies for grammatical role assignment only after their developing system has incorporated other cues (e.g., case marking, acoustic stress).

P4. Learners first process elements in sentence/utterance initial position best.
  P4a. Learners process elements in final position before elements in medial position.

Source: Based on VanPatten (1996).

much in their working memory before attentional resources are depleted and working memory is forced to dump information to make room for more (incoming) information. The principles are listed in Table 1.

That learners are driven to get meaning from input (P1) has a set of consequences, the first being that words (content lexical items) are searched out first since, at least in the learner's mind— if not in any fluent speaker-listener's—words are the principal source of referential meaning (P1a). Of importance for the acquisition of grammatical form, then, is principle P1b. This principle holds that when content lexical items and a grammatical form both encode the same meaning and when both are present in a sentence/utterance, it is the lexical item and not the grammatical form that learners attend to for the meaning. Following are examples from Spanish:

a. *Ayer mis padres me llamaron para decirme algo importante.* Here, both the lexical item *ayer* and the verb inflection *-aron* encode pastness. The learner does not have to allocate attentional resources to a verb form to grasp that the action took place before the present. At the same time, *mis padres* as well as *-aron* encode plurality; again the learner does not have to allocate attentional resources to an inflection to know that the subject is plural.

b. *No creo que comprenda Ramón lo que dice el profesor.* In this example, both *no creo* and the *-a* of *comprenda* are related to mood (what textbooks call "the subjunctive of doubt" and what linguists might call "nonaffirmation"). The presence of *No creo* mitigates against the processing of the *-a* since the latter adds to the sentence no information that the learner cannot get from the former. (We will not repeat here the subject-verb agreement processing problem explicated earlier.)

c. *Dicen que Julieta está enferma y que no viene a clase.* In this example, the presence of *enferma* and the context of not coming to class will give the learner the concept of perfection ("temporariness" in layperson's terms) and mitigate against the processing of *está.* Likewise, it is *Julieta* from which the learner gets gender and not from the *-a* of *enferma.*

What these examples help to illustrate is that a great deal of form that is meaning-oriented (i.e., is related to some semantic concept in the real world—what I call referential meaning) may also be expressed by a lexical item or phrase elsewhere in the sentence or the discourse. This observation led VanPatten (1985) to posit the construct *communicative value.* Communicative value refers to the meaning that a form contributes to overall sentence meaning and is based on two features: [± inherent semantic value] and [± redundancy]. A given form can have [+ semantic value and – redundancy], [+ semantic value and + redundancy], [– semantic value and + redundancy], and finally [– semantic value and – redundancy]. In general, a form's communicative value is greater if it has the characteristics [+ semantic value/– redundancy] than if it has the characteristics [+ semantic value/+ redundancy]. In short, if meaning can be retrieved elsewhere and not just from the form itself, then the communicative value of the form is diminished. Forms with [– semantic value], regardless of redundancy, contain no communicative value. In the earlier examples a–c, the preterit inflection *-aron*, the subjunctive marker *-a*, and the copular verb *está* are all [+ redundant] in that their semantic value is present lexically somewhere else. One should note, however, that redundancy is not absolute; the preterit (or any other tense marker) does not always co-occur with a temporal expression in an utterance. In the input one might also hear utterances such as *¿Dónde estudiaste?* (Where did you study?) in which no lexical item provides clues to tense (or to person/number). However, one rarely hears the subjunctive without a main clause that triggers it, and one rarely hears copular verbs without a predicate of some kind. In short, some forms are more redundant than others.

The nature of communicative value, then, is important for input processing: The more a form has communicative value, the more likely it is to get processed and made available in the intake data for acquisition (P1c). Pity the poor form that has no, or consistently little, communicative value; it is the least likely to get processed and, without help, may never get acquired. In nonclassroom contexts (and even with many classroom learners), the absence of such forms in learner speech indicates that the learner has perhaps not processed them in the input. Of course, frequency in the input and other aspects of language may be factors that along with communicative value may doom a form never to get picked up by a learner. Likewise, the intersection of high communicative value and frequency may have a favorable effect on acquisition.

Input processing is also concerned with word order. P3, the first noun strategy, may have important effects on the acquisition of a language that does not follow strict SVO word order. In each of the following sentences in Spanish, the first noun-phrase the learner encounters is not a subject, but the learner may very well attempt to encode it as such:

d. *A Juan no le gusta esta clase mucho.* (John does not like this class much.)

e. *La vi yo en la fiesta anoche.* (I saw her at the party last night.)

f. *Se levanta temprano.* (He/She gets up early.)

g. *Nos faltan varios libros.* (We are missing several books.)

Research has shown that learners do indeed encode such pronouns and noun-phrases as subjects (e.g., *Juan* is the subject of d, *la* is the subject of e and means "she"), thus delivering erroneous intake to their developing linguistic systems. In this case, it is not that meaning is gotten elsewhere; it is that meaning is not gotten at all or is gotten wrong.

Research by Barcroft and VanPatten (1997) as well as Rosa and O'Neill (1998) has led to another important processing principle, that of position in the utterance. From P4 it is clear that learners perceive and process items in one position better than another. This means, for example, that learners are much more likely to pick up question words and their syntax than, say, object pronouns or the subjunctive. Learners may not need to be told that Spanish inverts subject and verb in yes/no questions because this is immediately evident in simple questions that learners hear from the first day of exposure (i.e., the verb is in initial position, the most salient). This kind of intake data may be important for UG-related aspects of acquisition such as verb-movement, discussion that is taken up in detail elsewhere (VanPatten 1996, Chapter 5) and is beyond the scope of the present paper.

To summarize, research on IP attempts to describe which linguistic data in the input get attended to during comprehension and which do not (or which are privileged and which are not) and which grammatical roles learners assign to nouns. Intake is that subset of filtered input that the learner actually processes and holds in working memory during on-line comprehension. Intake is thus grammatical information as it relates to the meaning that learners have comprehended (or think they have comprehended). To be sure, IP is but one set of processes related to acquisition; that learners derive some kind of intake from the input does mean that the data contained in the intake automatically make their way into the developing mental representation of the L2 in the learner's head (i.e., intake ≠ acquisition). In previous work (VanPatten 1996), accommodation of intake and restructuring are seen as processes separate from IP. In addition, how learners access their developing system to make output is also a distinct set of processes. (For detailed discussion see VanPatten 1996, Chapters 2 and 5, and the references contained therein.)

Future research will no doubt add to the current model of IP or push for alterations in it—and the presentation of the model in this chapter has been necessarily brief and without details. Nonetheless, the sketch provided here is sufficient for discussion concerning classroom SLA and a focus on form, the subject of the next section of this paper.

Processing Instruction: A Description

If it is the case that learners' input processing may lead to less grammatically rich input than previously thought, a logical question arises: Is there a way to enrich learners' intake using insights from IP? Another way to ask this question is To what degree we can either manipulate learner attention during IP and/or manipulate input data so that more and better form-meaning connections are made? In a series of studies, we have investigated this question by examining the possible benefits of what is called processing instruction (Cadierno 1995; Cheng 1995; Pereira 1996; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993a, 1993b; VanPatten and Oikennon 1996; VanPatten and Sanz 1995). Processing instruction (PI) is a type of grammar instruction with three basic characteristics:

1. Learners are given information about a linguistic structure or form.
2. Learners are informed about a particular IP strategy that may negatively affect their picking up of the form/structure during comprehension.
3. Learners are pushed to process the form/structure during activities with structured input—input that is manipulated in particular ways so that learners become dependent on form and structure to get meaning and/or to privilege the form/structure in the input so that learners have a better chance of attending to it (i.e., learners are pulled away from their natural processing tendencies toward more optimal tendencies).

Characteristics 1–3 can be exemplified in the case of the preterit tense. We know from principle P1b that learners prefer to process lexical items to grammatical items when both encode the same meaning. In the case of the preterit tense, learners naturally rely on temporal expressions such as *yesterday, last week, when I was in high school,* and so on, not on verbal inflections as cues to pastness. Knowing this, a PI supplemental lesson on preterit would first begin with a brief explanation of what the preterit tense looks like. Ideally, we would break the explanation into parts so that learners are focusing on one form at a time in the input (thus the lesson on preterit would consist of several subsections). Following this, learners would be told that it is natural to skip over verb forms when listening or reading and that people tend to rely on other cues to get pastness. They would then be told that this is not the best strategy for picking up verb forms and that in the activities that follow they will be pushed to attend to verb forms for cues about present, past, and future. Subsequently they would work through written and aural activities in which temporal expressions are removed and the verb is the sole bearer of pastness. These activities are called *structured input activities.* Here are two examples:

Example A

Listen to the statements your instructor makes. Is the action expressed in the present, past, or future?

[INSTRUCTOR'S SCRIPT: 1. *Juan habló con sus padres por teléfono.* 2. *Maria estudia mucho para los exámenes, etc.* Translation: 1. John talked with his parents on the phone. 2. Mary studies a lot for her exams.]

Example B

Listen to each sentence your instructor reads. Which of the expressions listed could be included in the sentence?

1. a. *anoche*	b. *ahora*	c. *mañana*
2. a. *en este momento*	b. *la semana pasada*	c. *en dos minutos*

[INSTRUCTOR'S SCRIPT: 1. *Juan no llamó.* 2. *¿Qué hace Maria?*, etc.]

These examples are called *referential* structured input activities. Referential activities are those for which there is a right or wrong answer and for which the learner must rely on the targeted grammatical form to get meaning (in this case, broad temporal reference). Normally, a sequence of structured input activities would begin with two or three referential activities.

Following referential activities, learners are engaged in *affective* structured input activities. These are activities in which learners express an opinion, belief, or some other affective response and are engaged in processing information about the real world. Following is an example of an affective activity that could follow the earlier referential activities:

Example C

Step 1. Following is a list of things your instructor might have done last night. Check off those that you think he/she did and then put them in chronological order.

Our instructor . . .

___ had a cocktail.
___ read the newspaper.
___ walked the dog.
___ prepared dinner.
___ watched TV.
___ went out with a friend.
___ called a student.

___ slept for eight hours.
___ exercised.
___ cleaned a closet.

Step 2. A volunteer will read the statements from step 1 to the rest of the class; everyone else should express agreement or disagreement. In the end, your instructor will tell you and the class if you are right.

Note that learners respond to the input in step 1 and that in step 2 they are still working with the input by reading it aloud and/or listening to someone else who is reading it aloud. Focus is on both form and meaning at the same time.

The sequence would, for example in Spanish, repeat itself four or five times in order to treat all forms of the verb (i.e., first person singular, second person singular, and so on). Each time explanations would be kept simple since only one form is in focus. (An additional sample using the subjunctive in Spanish is provided in the appendix.) This brings us to a set of working guidelines developed in Lee and VanPatten (1995) to help instructors create their own structured input activities.

1. *One thing at a time.* This guideline means that only one form and one function should be in focus in any given activity and in any short sequence of activities. For example, in the two referential activities followed by the affective activity, only the third person singular was in focus for the simple past to talk about isolated one-time events.
2. *Keep meaning in focus.* Unlike traditional instruction that includes a role for mechanical drilling, all structured input activities include (1) the meaning of the form has to be processed or (2) the propositional meaning of the sentence and the form have to be processed. Circling verb forms in a passage, for example, does not focus on meaning and does not constitute a structured input activity.
3. *Move from sentence to discourse.* Learners are much more likely to attend to form if they begin with sentences (and the shorter the better) than if they begin with narrative or descriptive discourse. This guideline suggests that when focused on form, lessons should always begin with sentence-level activities.

4. *Learners must do something with the input.* Learners cannot be passive listeners or readers of structured input. They must demonstrate that they are paying attention by checking boxes, indicating *yes/no*, supplying a word, and so on.
5. *Use both oral and written input.* Since some learners are visually oriented and written material helps them to hear better, activities should include both oral and written input either across the activities or within each.
6. *Keep the learners' processing strategies in mind.* This means that each activity and each input sentence must be structured to push learners away from their natural processing strategies. For example, inclusion of adverbs in the past tense lesson sketched above would detract learners from attending to the form.

It is important to note that PI is not just another comprehension-based approach to language instruction such as TPR or immersion; PI is a focus on form that serves as a supplement to existing communicative and acquisition-oriented approaches, including comprehension-based approaches such as TPR, the Natural Approach, and immersion. In short, comprehension-based approaches can live with or without PI, but PI is not intended to exist on its own. Since the point of PI is to assist the learner in making form-meaning connections during input processing, it is more appropriate to view it as a type of focus on form or input-enhancement (Sharwood Smith 1993).

Issues in Theory and Research

Since the publication of VanPatten and Cadierno (1993b), criticisms and counterevidence have appeared regarding PI (e.g., Collentine 1998; DeKeyser and Sokalski 1995; Ellis 1994; Salaberry 1997; Toth 1997). Following are four major issues that emerge in these and other publications: (1) that PI is not grounded in any theory; (2) that PI has been tested with simple rules and structures; (3) that there are methodological problems with treatment in the PI studies; and (4) that PI discounts the role of output in SLA. We will examine each criticism in detail and then end with a brief discussion of research methodology.

One criticism that has been made regarding PI is that it is not theoretically grounded. Salaberry (1997), for example, states that "there is no theoretical or empirical support" (p. 425) for PI. In criticizing the VanPatten and Cadierno (1993b) study, Salaberry uses as a point of departure the criticisms of Krashen's Monitor Theory and argues that, if Krashen is wrong, then VanPatten and Cadierno must be wrong as well. However, one need not be supportive of Krashen's Monitor Theory to be supportive of PI or any other input-oriented focus on form (see, for example, Gass 1997; Jordens 1996; Sharwood Smith 1993; and others). The question is whether one believes in the fundamental role of input in SLA, which VanPatten and Cadierno (1993a, 1993b) clearly do (and as the vast majority of scholars in SLA do). For example, in the recent volume edited by Doughty and Williams (1998), all contributors either explicitly or implicitly attribute a fundamental role in acquisition to input. And Gass (1997) begins her book with "The concept of input is perhaps the single most important concept of second language acquisition" (p. 1). Again, the position is that successful acquisition cannot happen without input.

As a focus on form, PI is not grounded in Monitor Theory but in *the psycholinguistics of sentence processing and form processing during comprehension.* That is, PI takes as its point of departure a model of input processing and how learners do or do not make form-meaning connections during on-line comprehension. In terms of its theoretical underpinnings, PI has been reviewed by a number of other scholars (Ellis 1998; Jordens 1996; Skehan 1998) who have made the opposite conclusion of Salaberry (1997), namely, that PI is a type of grammar instruction or focus-on-form that is grounded in contemporary cognition and psycholinguistics. That PI is grounded in a model of input processing has escaped a number of researchers attempting to do replicative work. These studies equate PI with mere exposure to structures in input, and the treatments used in them do not systematically push learners to alter their processing strategies (i.e., they do not push learners to make better and more correct form-meaning mappings). (See, for example, Kubota 1996; Nagata 1995; Salaberry 1997; Toth 1997.) Part of the problem in replication studies of PI, as discussed in Sanz and VanPatten (1998), is that a number of researchers have reduced the complexity of PI to mere comprehension and either explicitly or implicitly claim that the original VanPatten and Cadierno research was "comprehension versus production" (see, for example, the title of Nagata's 1995 replication study, "Production Versus

Comprehension Practice in Second Language Acquisition"). And in these so-called replication studies, there is no explicit or even implicit psycholinguistic purpose in the input-oriented activities the researchers developed. Collentine (1998) comes closest to creating PI. However, his materials, too, fall short of true PI, and he even (erroneously) states that the focus of his research, the subjunctive, does not lend itself to PI. As our appendix (as well as the work of Pereira 1996 and work in progress by Farley) shows, all uses of the subjunctive can be taught via PI. In short, it is not clear at all that other researchers systematically attempted to overcome a nonproductive input processing strategy via their intended replication of PI.

In VanPatten and Cadierno (1993a, 1993b), we researched PI versus *traditional* foreign language instruction, defined as explanation plus output practice that moves learners from mechanical to communicative drills. Because we do not argue against other types of output activities, especially those that encourage interaction, such as task-based instruction, the general conclusion we reached is still tenable: *Traditional* instruction (which, by nature, is *at the surface* output-oriented) is not as good as PI in assisting learners in the creation of form-meaning relationships useful for acquisition.

A second criticism of PI is that it has been researched using easy structures. DeKeyser and Sokalski (1995), for example, argue that clitic object pronouns and word order in Spanish as used in VanPatten and Cadierno (1993a) are simple structures and may have influenced our results. DeKeyser and Sokalski state, "This element of morphosyntax [clitic objects and placement] is simple to produce, yet difficult (for English speakers) to comprehend" (p. 621). Their reasoning is that the structure encodes an "obvious" agent/patient relationship and that the word-order rules are simple. (It is not clear to me why production and comprehension would differ.) This reasoning contrasts with data from spontaneous speech collected by Malcolm Johnston (personal communication) who uses Pienemann's Processability Theory to account for learner output (Pienemann 1998). Use of object clitics is a late(r)-acquired feature in this model and in the data provided by Johnston. Previously published data, again gathered from communicative tasks and spontaneous speech, support the idea that use of clitics and their placement is not as easy as DeKeyser and Sokalski claim (see, for example, Andersen 1983 and VanPatten 1987).

At a theoretical level, however, there is more to complexity than formal features. Complexity in acquisition may have more to do with *processing* of language (either input or output) than surface formal features do. This is clearly pointed out by de Graaff (1997) and Pienemann (1998). From a production perspective, Pienemann argues that complexity in processing is due to increased demands on linguistic operations performed during on-line production. Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965), for example, point out that adjective agreement in Spanish is not formally or semantically complex at all but that fluent nonnative speakers make errors with this structure more often than we might expect. Pienemann would account for this in that adjective agreement stretches across node boundaries in an utterance and that the simplest agreement would be NP internal (*la casa blanca* "the white house") and the most difficult would be across clause boundaries (*¿Como se llama la mujer que dicen que es antipática?* "What's the name of the woman who they say is not very nice?"). Within Pienemann's framework, one way in which processing complexity increases is when linguistic information must be held outside of its immediate constituent for use later in the utterance.

The point to be made here is that clitic object pronouns are complex in terms of processing, both for input and output (albeit for different reasons). What is more, since VanPatten and Cadierno (1993b) published their study, there has been research on inflectional structures (the preterit tense in Spanish), lexical-semantic structures (the contrasting copular verbs in Spanish), and clause-dependent mood (the subjunctive in Spanish). In each case, PI is found to have a positive effect on learner performance. Given the variety of structures used and their notorious difficulty for learners of Spanish (at least for L1 English speakers), complexity of structure does not appear to be an issue that affects the validity of studies on PI.

A third major criticism of PI concerns the actual treatment used in the studies and how it compares with other treatments. Ellis (1998), DeKeyser and Sokalski (1995), and others have suggested that the kind of instruction contrasted with PI (namely traditional instruction) and PI itself are too different to allow for conclusions about the relative efficacy of PI. These scholars point out that in the studies in which TI and PI are contrasted, PI provides more information to subjects, and TI involves less focus on meaning compared with PI. As for PI providing more information to subjects, pushing learners to process for form in the input suggests that certain information be provided. First, learners should be told about their processing strategies and that they are not optimal for acquisition. Second, linguistic information is provided that displays the meaning contrasts that the PI is attempting to get learners to process when exposed to the input. This type of information is not provided in TI, an instructional mode that tends to provide learners only with paradigms and lists of rules or guides for usage. The criticism that PI provides more information than does TI stems largely, I believe, from the misconception that studies on PI are simply about comprehension versus production. If it were the case that all we (VanPatten and Cadierno 1993a, 1993b) were interested in was comprehension versus production, then indeed information would have to be held constant to assess the relative contribution of these two skills. However, PI is not about comprehension alone, and the original studies were not about comprehension versus production; they were about PI and TI.

Traditional instruction is what it is; it can be found in most contemporary foreign language textbooks and can be observed in a great number of language classrooms across the country. PI is relatively new, and we needed to work out the specifics of what it might be like to apply the model of input processing to instructional concerns. It is what it now is. In short, as a series of studies in which PI and TI are contrasted, there is no problem in terms of treatment. It is worth noting, however, that as one possible answer to the criticism of treatment, VanPatten and Oikennon (1996) presented the findings of a partial replication of VanPatten and Cadierno (1993b) in which all explicit information was removed from one PI group (i.e., it received structured input only). The findings suggest that even without the "extra information" provided by PI, learners made significant gains in performance across two measures, suggesting that while possibly useful, the explicit and "extra" information was not necessary. Carefully structured input activities may be enough to push learners to make more and better form-meaning mappings.

Regarding the criticism that PI is more meaning-oriented than TI, again, this is the nature of the two instructional treatments and had to be built into the original VanPatten and Cadierno (1993b) study. TI historically contains mechanical activities, and these activities abound in contemporary foreign language textbooks. Because PI is about making form-meaning connections during intake derivation, it has to be concerned with meaning from the very beginning. Again, the criticism about meaning-orientation may largely be due to the misconception that we are equating PI with comprehension and TI with production.

The fourth criticism of PI centers on the role of output. Because our work has been misinterpreted as input versus output, some scholars have claimed that PI either discounts output altogether or minimizes its role. To clarify my and my coauthors' thoughts on output, I would like to quote from our publications:

> *. . . we feel that, in addition to the fluid and "freer" interaction that often happens in communicative classrooms, it is important for instructors to also develop focused output activities that encourage learners to be accurate while also attending to meaning (VanPatten and Cadierno 1993b, p. 239).*
>
> *While input is* necessary *for creating a system, input is not* sufficient *for developing the ability to use language in a communicative context . . . Production of the foreign language (be it writing or speaking) involves those processes that operate at point III [in VanPatten's sketch of second-language acquisition and use]. These processes include access (retrieval of correct forms), monitoring (editing one's speech when one realizes "something is wrong"), and production strategies (stringing forms and words together to make sentences) and are affected by a variety of factors (Lee and VanPatten 1995, p. 117, emphasis original).*
>
> *. . . in order to bring communication (expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning) into the classroom, instructors will have to look to something other than form-focused activities. Instructors need to go beyond drills to provide the opportunities learners need to develop communicative language proficiency (Lee and VanPatten 1995, p. 156).*
>
> *[I am] not advocating that processing instruction occupy all of instructors' and learners' time to the exclusion of interaction, reading, and other components of a communicative approach . . . we also need to ask ourselves questions of a much more practical nature: Can and should processing instruction occur outside the classroom? Because processing instruction is input-based, can computers deliver effective processing instruction (VanPatten 1996, p. 158)?*

These statements clearly show that PI is not at odds with output; PI is one type of focus-on-form available to instructors whose classes are communicative in nature (Doughty and Williams 1998, Chapter 10). It might be that researchers who have focused on output and interaction suggest something contrary to the model of input processing as well as PI. Following are quotes from two such scholars:

> *If what is crucial about interaction is the fact that input becomes salient in some way (i.e., enhanced), then it matters little how salience comes about—whether through a teachers' self-modification, one's own request for clarification, or observation of another's request for clarification. The crucial point is that input becomes available for attentional resources and attention is focused on a particular form or meaning. When learners are in an interactive mode, they can focus on what is necessary for them—that is, their own attention can drive the interaction (Gass 1997, p. 129).*
>
> *The claim is not that negotiation causes learning nor that there is a theory of learning based on interaction. Rather, negotiation is a facilitator of learning . . . it is one means by which input can become comprehensible and manageable (Gass 1997, p. 132).*
>
> *I have hypothesized that, under certain circumstances, output promotes noticing. This is important if there is a basis to the claim that noticing a form in input must occur in order for it to be acquired (Swain 1998, p. 66).*
>
> *Thus, learners may use their output as a way of trying out new language forms and structures as they stretch their interlanguage to meet communicative needs; they may use output just to see what works and what does not (Swain 1998, p. 68).*
>
> *. . . by encouraging metatalk among second and foreign language students, we may be helping students to make use of second language acquisition processes. That is, metatalk may be one pedagogical means by which we can ensure that other language acquisition processes operate. It is essential, however, that this metatalk is encouraged in contexts where the learners are engaged in "making meaning," that is, where the language being used and reflected upon through metatalk is serving a communicative function (Swain 1998, p. 69).*

I see no contradiction, either in theory or in practice, between the comments made by Gass (1997) and Swain (1998) and those made by me and my colleagues. Both Gass and Swain clearly state that one function (perhaps the major one) of making output and interacting in the second or foreign language is that it may push the learner to attend to input. Attention to input is what PI is about. Swain clearly states that output is necessary for stretching the communicative limits of one's interlanguage; Lee and VanPatten (1995, Chapter 8) would not argue with this at all. Swain also states that metatalk, as a result of making output during interaction, may promote processes necessary for acquisition. One such process may very well be to relate a meaning to form so that when it is encountered in the input, the form has a better chance of being processed to form part of a learner's intake.

My reading of those who criticize PI for its lack of attention to output is that they misinterpret and/or misapply the current literature on output and interaction as exemplified in Gass' and Swain's comments. DeKeyser and Sokalski (1995), for example, state, "In more recent years *production practice* has been advocated most strongly by Merrill Swain . . ." (p. 615). My concern here is the use of the term "production practice," a term that sounds very much like noncontextualized sentence-level production activities. DeKeyser and Sokalski may or may not have intended this meaning, but this is the way they operationalized output in their study. To cite Merrill Swain (1998) to support "production practice" is misleading. In her 1985 and subsequent publications, Swain clearly couches output within negotiated interactions, interactions in which learners are pushed to be more precise in their communication. Swain may believe that focused production practice is good; she also may not. The point here is that her now well-known "output hypothesis" is not about mere practice but about creation of meaning and its delivery during face-to-face interaction.

In an interesting study that attempts to research the output hypothesis directly, Bigelow, Fearnow, Fujiwara, and Isumi (1997) had subjects in an experimental group underline conditional forms in input passages and then subsequently produce language during tasks in which conditional forms could be used. A control group underlined conditional forms in the input passages, but instead of production, they answered comprehension questions on the passage. The researchers hypothesized that the experimental group would notice more conditional forms in the input passages, would incorporate more conditional forms in their output, and would show greater accuracy with the conditional. Their first hypothesis was not confirmed (the control group noticed just as many forms), and the second and third hypotheses were only partially confirmed (effects did not last over a two-phase period of study). Although this study is intriguing for a variety of reasons, I would again like to draw attention to how the output hypothesis is realized in an experimental study. Bigelow et al. had their subjects retell the input passages in writing during the different phases of the study; that is, first subjects read and underlined forms, then they retold (via written narrative) the passage they had just read. This was done twice. Again we are faced with output being operationalized as something different from what Swain (and Gass, for that matter) describes in her work. As I understand it, pushed output and any type of noticing of form happen during real-time interaction and are controlled by the learner to a certain degree. During interaction, the learner produces language that may be incorrect and from some sort of interactional signal may notice that the other person creates the same meaning but with different language.

Before concluding, I would like to be clear on one point: I have countered the criticisms and research of a number of persons in this section—this does not mean that their research or studies are faulty. Indeed, I have found the works of DeKeyser, Salaberry, Toth, and others stimulating and their results interesting. My point here is that their findings vis-à-vis PI can be explained and interpreted not due to problems with PI, but instead how they perceive PI and its intended potential effect(s) on acquisition as well as how they interpret the work on output.

If there is one criticism that is certainly valid, it is the same for all studies on focus-on-form; namely, that we have yet to see any durability with PI. The longest stretch between PI and a testing session in any of our studies has been one month. Currently, we are investigating the durability of PI with a year-long study and will report on that at a later date.

Issues Relating to Language Program Direction

It may not immediately be clear just how the issues presented earlier relate to language program direction. One area of possible application is this: If scholars and other researchers have certain misinterpretations about PI, what ideas do teaching assistants walk away with when presented with novel concepts, such as processing instruction? Recently I have been involved in putting together a videotape for teacher training.

One of the areas I wanted to cover was structured input and how it is used in the classroom. As part of the project, I have been watching videotaped classrooms in Spanish basic language. Two things in particular have struck me. The first is that some teaching assistants spend a great deal of time explaining grammar concepts that they don't need to. Recall that in PI, explicit information is minimized by the "one thing at a time" principle. One simply doesn't need to explain much, and the VanPatten and Oikennon (1996) study showed that it is structured input that pushes learners to make form-meaning connections; explicit information adds little or nothing to the process.

The second thing that I have noticed is that some teaching assistants actually make the students repeat sentences in structured input activities; students are not allowed to say "I agree" or "I disagree" or "The answer is a." Some teaching assistants make them say the sentence aloud for practice, as explained to me by one assistant when I queried him on the technique. Recall that during structured input activities learners are supposed to be engaged in processing form-meaning connections while listening to and/or reading sentences.

There is nothing terribly wrong with the two practices just described, but what is interesting is how some teaching assistants cannot simply learn a new technique or approach: *They appear to need to blend old with new.* In the examples, they have imported lengthy explanations and repetition from previous experience with more traditional approaches to grammar into PI. For those language program directors who are attempting to implement PI in basic language courses, caution is warranted when it comes to making the leap from theory to practice.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have reviewed both input processing and processing instruction as they relate to the concept of form and meaning. Input processing is concerned with strategies for attaching meaning to form during on-line comprehension; processing instruction is concerned with pushing learners to make better and more form-meaning connections during comprehension. I also reviewed four general criticisms of processing instruction and argued that the criticisms were without merit. I argued that, contrary to these criticisms, (1) processing instruction is theoretically grounded; (2) it has been researched on a variety of difficult structures; (3) the studies on processing instruction were not investigating input versus output but rather processing instruction versus traditional instruction; and (4) there is nothing incompatible with the role of output in SLA and input processing or processing instruction. I also briefly touched upon issues related to language program direction and the implementation of PI.

As we await further research on the effects of PI, we can continue to work within the model of input processing developed in VanPatten (e.g., 1996). This model is the first to attempt to answer the question "What form-meaning connections are made under what conditions?" and to link on-line comprehension to acquisition (the accommodation of intake and the restructuring of the developing system). Given the focus of the present volume, we should continue with the theoretical and descriptive research on input processing. An interesting and promising avenue to pursue would be parsing. The question here is "What type of structural tree does the learner's processing mechanism assign to input strings?" Given that form and meaning may be the foundation upon which syntax eventually emerges, parsing and its relationship to meaning and intake data may prove to be useful to SLA theory in general.

Note

1. I would like to thank Joe Barcroft, Cristina Sanz, James F. Lee, and Albert Valdman for feedback on an earlier version of this chapter. The usual caveat applies.

Works Cited

Andersen, Roger. 1983. Transfer to Somewhere. In *Language Transfer in Language Learning*, edited by Susan Gass and Larry Selinker, 177–201. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Barcroft, Joe, and Bill VanPatten. 1997. Acoustic Salience of Grammatical Forms: The Effect of Location, Stress, and Boundedness on Spanish L2 Input Processing. In *Contemporary Perspectives on the Acquisition of Spanish: Production, Processing, and Comprehension*, edited by Ana Perez-Leroux and William R. Glass, 109–121. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Bigelow, Martha, Sarah Fearnow, Miho Fujiwara, and Shinichi Isumi. 1997. Testing the Output Hypothesis: Effects of Output on Noticing and Second Language Acquisition. Paper delivered at the annual Second Language Research Forum, East Lansing, MI.

Cadierno, Teresa. 1995. Formal Instruction from a Processing Perspective: An Investigation into the Spanish Past Tense. *The Modern Language Journal* 79: 179–193.

Cheng, An Chun. 1995. Grammar Instruction and Input Processing: The Acquisition of Spanish *ser* and *estar*. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Collentine, Joseph. 1998. Processing Instruction and the Subjunctive. *Hispania* 81: 576–587.

de Graaff, Rick. 1997. *Differential Effects of Explicit Instruction on Second Language Acquisition.* HIL Dissertations, 35. Amsterdam: Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.

DeKeyser, Robert M., and Karl J. Sokalski. 1995. The Differential Role of Comprehension and Production Practice. *Language Learning* 46: 613–642.

Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams, eds. 1998. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* 2d ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

______. 1998. *SLA Research and Language Teaching.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Farley, A. P. (in progress). A Comparison of Processing Instruction and Meaning-based Instruction in the Learning and Teaching of the Spanish Subjunctive. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Gass, Susan M. 1997. *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kubota, Mikio. 1996. The Effects of Instruction Plus Feedback on Japanese University Students of EFL: A Pilot Study. *Bulletin of Chofu Gakuen Women's Junior College* 28: 59–95.

Johnson, Malcolm. 1996. Personal communication.

Jordens, Peter. 1996. Input and Instruction in Second Language Acquisition. In *Investigating Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Peter Jordens and Josine Lalleman, 407–449. Berlin, Ger.: Mouton de Gruyter.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane, and Michael H. Long. 1991. *Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research.* London: Longman.

Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nagata, N. 1995. Production versus Comprehension Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Unpublished manuscript, San Francisco.

Pereira, Isabel. 1996. Markedness and Instructed SLA: An Experiment in Teaching the Spanish Subjunctive. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Pienemann, Manfred. 1998. *Processability Theory and Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rosa, Elena, and Michael O'Neill. 1998. Effects of Stress and Location on Acoustic Salience at the Initial Stages of Spanish L2 Input Processing. *Spanish Applied Linguistics* 2: 24–52.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 1997. The Role of Input and Output Practice in Second Language Acquisition. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 53: 422–451.

Sanz, Cristina, and Bill VanPatten. 1998. On Input Processing, Processing Instruction, and the Nature of Replication Tasks: A Response to M. Rafael Salaberry. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 54: 263–273.

Sharwood Smith, Michael. 1993. Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical Bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 165–179.

Skehan, Peter. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Stockwell, Robert, J. Donald Bowen, and John W. Martin. 1965. *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swain, Merrill. 1985. Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development. In *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Susan Gass and Carolyn Madden, 235–253. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

______. 1998. Focus on Form through Conscious Reflection. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 64–81. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Toth, Paul D. 1997. Linguistic and Pedagogical Perspectives on Acquiring Second Language Morphosyntax: A Look at Spanish *se*. Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh.

VanPatten, Bill. 1984. Processing Strategies and Morpheme Acquisition. In *Universals of Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Fred R. Eckman, Larry H. Bell, and Diane Nelson, 88–98. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

______. 1985. Communicative Value and Information Processing in Second Language Acquisition. In *On TESOL '84: A Brave New World,* edited by Elliot Judd, Paul Nelson, and Diane Messerschmitt, 88–99. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

______. 1987. Classroom and Naturalistic Language Acquisition: A Comparison of Two Case Studies in the Acquisition of Clitic Pronouns in Spanish. In *Language and Language Use: Studies in Spanish,* edited by Terrell A. Morgan, James F. Lee, and Bill VanPatten, 241–262. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

______. 1990. Attending to Content and Form in the Input: An Experiment in Consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 287–301.

______. 1995. Cognitive Aspects of Input Processing in Second Language Acquisition. In *Studies in Language Learning and Spanish Linguistics,* edited by Peggy Heshemipour, Ricardo Maldonado, and Margaret van Naerssen, 170–183. New York: McGraw-Hill.

______. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction: Theory and Research.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

VanPatten, Bill and Teresa Cadierno. 1993a. Input Processing and Second Language Acquisition: A Role for Instruction. *The Modern Language Journal* 77: 45–57.

______. 1993b. Explicit Instruction and Input Processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 225–243.

VanPatten, Bill, and Soile Oikennon. 1996. Explanation vs. Structured Input in Processing Instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 495–510.

VanPatten, Bill, and Cristina Sanz. 1995. From Input to Output: Processing Instruction and Communicative Tasks. In *Second Language Acquisition Theory and Pedagogy,* edited by Fred R. Eckman, Diane Highland, Peter W. Lee, Jean Mileham, and Ruth R. Weber, 169–185. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Appendix

"Today we are going to learn a new verb form called the *subjunctive.* It is used in various kinds of sentences, but today we are going to focus on expressing doubt and disbelief. How would you say in Spanish that you believed the following statement?

Juan visita a sus padres con frecuencia.

You could say *Creo que Juan visita a sus padres con frecuencia.* Now suppose you wanted to say that you didn't believe it or that you doubted it. You would say something like

No creo que Juan visite a sus padres con frecuencia.
Dudo que Juan visite a sus padres con frecuencia.

Did you notice that the verb *visite* ends in *e* rather than *a*? This is the subjunctive form, and it must be used in all sentences with *dudar que, no creer que,* and other expressions. To talk about someone else, you would use a form that ends in *e* if the verb is *ar* and *a* if the verb is *er* or *ir.* As you will see in the activities that follow, the stem of the subjunctive is not the same as for the present tense indicative—what you use to talk about your daily routines and other typical events. The subjunctive stem is based on the *yo* form of the present indicative. Can you recognize the verbs for the following subjunctive forms?

conozca
salga
tenga
viva
tome
almuerce

A few irregular forms you will see in the activities that follow are *sea* (from *ser*), *vaya* (from *ir*) and *haya* (from *haber*).

One of the difficulties in acquiring the subjunctive is that you may not hear it or pay attention to it. While we talk about the subjunctive of doubt and disbelief, most learners of Spanish pay attention to phrases such as *no creo que* and *dudo que* since the subjunctive form is redundant. You will have to learn to pay attention to the verb form as you encounter it; the activities that follow will help you to begin to do so.

Activity A

Listen carefully to the sentence fragment that your instructor says. Then select the only phrase that could have introduced that sentence fragment. All sentences are about the typical professor at your university.

1. a. *Creo* b. *No creo*
2. a. *Creo* b. *Dudo*
3. a. *Estoy seguro de* b. *No estoy seguro de*
4. a. *No dudo* b. *Dudo*
5. a. *Es cosa sabida* b. *Me parece increíble*
6. a. *Sé* b. *No estoy seguro de*

[INSTRUCTOR'S SCRIPT: 1. *que viene a clase preparado.* 2. *que coma en McDonald's.* 3. *que viva cerca de la univeridad.* 4. *que conoce al presidente.* 5. *que tome el autobus.* 6. *que tiene mucho trabajo.*]

Activity B

Now listen to each option your instructor says aloud. Which could be the phrase that introduces each sentence fragment that follows?

1. *que será famoso algun día.*
2. *que venga mañana con su perro.*
3. *que lea más que yo.*
4. *que se levanta antes de las 6,00 A.M.*
5. *que se acueste después de las 12,00 A.M.*

[Instructor's script: 1. *Creo, No creo* 2. *Creo, Dudo* 3. *Sé, No estoy seguro de* 4. *Estoy seguro de, Dudo* 5. *Es verdad, No es verdad*]

Activity C

Match one of the expressions on the left to a phrase on the right to make grammatical statements about Bill Clinton. Then decide if the statement expresses your belief or not.

Columna A	**Columna B**
Dudo	*que siempre diga la verdad.*
No creo	*que es inteligente.*
Creo	*que Hillary esté contenta con él.*
Sé	*que sea buen amigo de Newt.*
No estoy seguro de	*que se divorciará de Hillary.*

Activity D

The class should select a fellow student as the focus of this activity. Review the statements that follow and see if, as a class, you agree with them.

1. *Creemos que es de ascendencia polaca.*
2. *Dudamos que tenga relaciones cercanas con la familia.*
3. *No creemos que vaya a casarse dentro de cinco años.*
4. *Estamos seguros de que le gusta esta clase.*
5. *Es dudoso que quiera hablar español como nativo.*
6. *No creemos que entienda el subjuntivo.*
7. *Sabemos que estudia mucho para esta clase.*

ATTENTION, AWARENESS, AND *FOCUS ON FORM* RESEARCH: A CRITICAL OVERVIEW

Ronald P. Leow
Georgetown University

Psycholinguistic research in second/foreign language (L2) learning/acquisition has recently made great inroads in becoming an essential component of teacher-education programs nationwide (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford 1997; Leow 1994a, 1994b, 1995a, 1995b). Indeed, the findings from this line of research investigation (e.g., processing instruction) have, to a certain extent, already impacted on language instruction in many L2 classrooms. Underlying these studies is the premise that some level of attention to, and in some studies awareness of, form or linguistic data is crucial for L2 processing to take place. To promote a further understanding of the roles of attention and awareness in foreign language learning, I will (1) briefly describe current theoretical approaches to the roles of attention and awareness in language learning, accompanied by empirical studies that have tested these approaches; (2) describe and situate recent *focus on form* studies conducted under an attentional framework; and (3) provide, based on the review, some general suggestions for teachers to consider in their role of language facilitators in the classroom setting.

Theoretical Foundation

Many second-language acquisition (SLA) studies have looked to the areas of cognitive psychology and cognitive science to provide an explanation of or theoretical account for the role cognitive processes play in SLA (e.g., Bialystok 1978, 1990, 1994; Carr and Curran 1994; R. Ellis 1993; Gass 1988; Hulstijn 1989; Hulstijn and Schmidt 1994; Krashen 1982; Robinson 1995a; Schmidt 1990, 1993, 1994, 1995; Sharwood Smith 1981, 1986, 1991, 1993; Tomlin and Villa 1994; VanPatten 1996). Studies in cognitive psychology, cognitive science, and SLA share the following feature: Learning does not take place without attention. In other words, attention is crucial for further long-term memory storage of L2 information to take place (see Carr and Curran 1994; Robinson 1995a; Schmidt 1990, 1993, 1994, 1995; Tomlin and Villa 1994 for comprehensive reviews of studies that support such a role of attention in language learning).

While the concept of attention has been interpreted in several ways (see Robinson 1995a, pp. 287–288 for further discussion), SLA research has focused primarily on the metaphor of a limited capacity channel or processor in which information competes for attentional resources available to the learner. This interpretation is based heavily on the works of Wickens (1980, 1984, 1989) who expanded Kahneman's (1973) single pool of attentional resources model of attention to include the allocation of attentional resources from multiple pools. Wickens argues that the difficulty level of two tasks performed simultaneously may depend on whether the attentional resources are coming from the same pool (serial processing) or different pools (parallel processing). For example, serial processing such as participating in two conversations at the same time is much more demanding than parallel processing which may be exemplified by driving a car and reading the billboards at the same time. However, Wickens concedes that concurrent processing may be possible in serial processing if one of the tasks has been automatized, thus freeing up additional resources for the other task.

A few SLA studies have been conducted under the metaphor of adult learners as limited-capacity processors of incoming information (Leow 1993, 1995c; VanPatten 1990). VanPatten investigated the attentional capacity of adult L2 learners in the aural mode. He hypothesized that attending to both form and meaning simultaneously would result in a cognitive overload. VanPatten found an overall decrease of comprehension when participants appeared to have attended to items deemed to be of less communicative value (such as the Spanish article *la* and the third person plural verb morpheme *-n*) when compared to attention paid to other items of more communicative value (such as the noun *inflación*). He also found superior performance at the advanced level when compared to the less advanced level, indicating that there may be a tendency at the early stages of language learning to process only for meaning due to the constraints of attentional resources to accommodate both form and meaning simultaneously. Attention was operationalized by asking participants to mark on a sheet of paper every instance targeted linguistic forms were noticed in the input.

Leow (1993, 1995c) addressed the issue of simplification on learners' intake in both written and aural modes. He hypothesized that textual simplification of input, resulting in a more statistically comprehensible text, should reduce the processing demands of adult L2 learners, thereby facilitating their intake of the linguistic items under study. In both the written (Leow 1993) and aural (Leow 1995c) modes, the results were the same: Simplification did not appear to facilitate any significant intake of the targeted forms in the input. Attention was operationalized by learners' performances on a postexposure multiple-choice recognition task; that is, participants were simply requested to choose one of four items that grammatically completed an incomplete sentence.

Three current cognitive approaches to the role of attention in second/foreign language learning have recently emerged (Robinson 1995a; Schmidt 1990, 1993, 1994, 1995; Tomlin and Villa 1994). In a reaction to what they call a coarse-grained approach to SLA attention-based research (e.g., the metaphor of adult learners as limited capacity processor), Tomlin and Villa (1994) propose a functionally based, fine-grained analysis of attention. They divide attention into three components: (1) alertness (an overall readiness to deal with incoming stimuli), (2) orientation (the direction of attentional resources to a certain type of stimuli), and (3) detection (the cognitive registration of the stimuli) (p. 190). It is the attentional function of detection, Tomlin and Villa strongly argue, that is crucial for acquisition to take place. Their functional model of input processing, built on the role of attention in SLA, predicts that alertness and orientation may separately or together enhance the chances of detection but neither is required for detection to occur (p. 197).

To my knowledge, there is only one study (Leow 1998a) that has attempted to investigate empirically the fine-grained analysis of attention proposed by Tomlin and Villa (1994) in an effort to make some definitive statement on the effects of attention in SLA. The main purpose of the study was to address the question of which attentional functions or mechanisms are crucial for intake and subsequent processing to take place *while* adult learners interact with L2 data. Using specially designed crossword puzzles, Leow found that participants who detected the targeted forms were able to take in and produce in writing significantly more targeted forms than those who did not demonstrate this cognitive registration. In addition, this superior effect for detection was evident on the immediate and two delayed posttests (administered five and eight weeks after exposure). While these findings lend empirical support for Tomlin and Villa's fine-grained analysis of attention at a morphological level, the issue of the role of awareness at the level of detection still remains to be addressed.[1]

Schmidt (1990, 1993, 1994, 1995) posits a more important role for awareness in his noticing hypothesis, also based on attentional processes. In this hypothesis, learners need consciously to "notice" or demonstrate a conscious apprehension and awareness of some particular form in the input before that form can be further processed. Schmidt views focal attention as isomorphic with awareness and rejects any dissociation between awareness and learning. In order to account for the distinction between intake/item learning and restructuring/system learning, Schmidt distinguishes two levels of awareness: at the level of noticing and at the level of understanding. The latter is related to learners' ability to analyze, compare, and test hypotheses and usually incorporates their ability to verbalize the underlying rules of the language.

With respect to the differing roles of awareness at the levels of detection (posited by Tomlin and Villa 1994) and noticing (posited by Schmidt 1993 and elsewhere), Robinson (1995a) attempts to incorporate both postulations into his model of the relationship between attention and memory. Robinson assigns detection, which involves attention but not awareness, to a stage of the learning process earlier than noticing. Robinson defines noticing as "detection plus rehearsal in short-term memory, prior to encoding in long-term memory" (p. 296), a process that involves some level of awareness and is crucial for learning to take place. Robinson, then, supports Schmidt's position that no learning can take place without some level of awareness present. He consequently assigns to Tomlin and Villa's attentional function of detection a less crucial role in the encoding of information in short-term memory.

The role of awareness in L2 learning has been a rather controversial issue in SLA. On the one hand, several researchers have supported a dissociation between learning and awareness (e.g., Carr and Curran 1994;

Curran and Keele 1993; Hardcastle 1993; Tomlin and Villa 1994; Velmans 1991); while on the other hand, others have rejected this dissociation (Robinson 1995a; Schmidt 1990 and elsewhere). In addition, there are methodological difficulties in operationalizing and measuring what constitutes awareness in SLA (see Leow 1997a for a review of relevant studies).

Recently, there have been a few studies that have specifically investigated the role of awareness in L2 behavior and learning through the use of on-line procedures such as think-aloud protocols (e.g., Leow 1997a; Rosa 1999; Rosa and O'Neill in press). These studies (which will be discussed in more detail later) have provided empirical support for the facilitative effects of awareness on foreign language behavior and learning and, consequently, Schmidt's noticing hypothesis. Findings indicated that (1) awareness at the level of noticing and understanding contributed substantially to a significant increase of learners' ability to take in the targeted form or structure, (2) awareness at the level of understanding led to significantly more intake and production when compared to awareness at the level of noticing, and (3) there exists a correlation between awareness at the level of understanding and usage of hypothesis testing and rule formation.

In summary, the brief review of current approaches to the roles of attention and awareness in SLA clearly indicates that the role of attention is generally accepted to be of import to what is taken in and further processed by the L2 learner. However, whether the same view holds for the role of awareness in SLA remains speculative. While the current findings of awareness-based studies appear to indicate a facilitative role for awareness on further L2 processing, whether awareness is crucial for such processing remains to be explored empirically (Leow 1997a).

The next section presents current SLA research conducted under an attentional framework that has addressed several different strands of L2 development in the foreign/second language classroom.

Current Classroom Research Conducted Under An Attentional Framework

The '90s have witnessed a substantial increase in studies that have attempted to draw learners' attention to specific forms in the input in an effort to promote intake and subsequent processing of such forms. Schmidt's (1993 and elsewhere) noticing hypothesis that conscious attention is indeed necessary for learning to take place has provided the theoretical foundation for many of these studies, with implications for a renewed role of grammar presentation/exposure in the language curriculum. Many of these studies conducted under an attentional framework have been included in what is known as *focus on form* instruction (Doughty and Williams 1998) that is premised on the roles of attention and awareness (noticing) in L2 learning. According to Doughty and Williams, this new focus is partially motivated from research performed in naturalistic and immersions settings (e.g., Harley 1992; Harley and Swain 1984) and research performed in controlled effects-of-instruction (Doughty 1991; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993) and negotiation of meaning (see Pica 1994 for a review) contexts. The findings, they argue, appear to demonstrate that instruction and interaction based primarily on a focus on meaning may not be sufficient for learners to pay attention to certain linguistic items in the input and that focusing learners' attention to form demonstrates positive effects on the development of learners' interlanguage.

The first mention of *focus on form* as a design feature in language teaching methodology appears in Long (1991) in which he critiqued what he called *focus on formS* instruction that is based primarily on a syllabus designed to present discrete grammar instruction in isolation with no apparent focus on meaning. Long defined *focus on form* as an attempt that "overtly draws students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (pp. 45–46). In other words, a key characteristic of the original *focus on form* instruction was the prerequisite focus on meaning before any attention to form is made. However, as Doughty and Williams (1998) point out, this definition offers limited opportunities for L2 research to be conducted in the L2 classroom. Consequently, Long and Robinson (1998) modified the original definition to broaden potential investigation into the effects of *focus on form* instruction and also to include more clearly the notion of noticing (see Schmidt 1990 and elsewhere) and the allocation of attentional resources (see Wickens 1980, 1984, 1989):

> Focus on form *refers to how focal attentional resources are allocated* . . . Focus on form *often consists of an occasional shift of attention to linguistic code features—by the teacher and/or one or more students—triggered by perceived problems with comprehension or production (Long and Robinson 1998, p. 23).*

A review of a representative number of *focus on form* studies reveals that the typical pretest, instructional treatment/exposure, posttest research design in which studies have employed many different techniques to draw learners' attention to targeted linguistic forms has been used. However, by relying on participants' performances on posttests conducted after the instructional treatment or exposure, they have not really operationalized the process of attention and/or awareness (noticing). Consequently, only claims as to the role that noticing played in learners' interaction with the targeted forms in the input can be made.

In addition to an incomplete empirical investigation of the effects of *focus on form*, the term itself can be confusing and open to several interpretations. On the one hand, if one were to follow closely Long and Robinson's (1998) definition clearly based on the notion of communication, there may be only a few studies that can claim to have addressed somewhat this narrow definition of *focus on form*. The closest one may be Doughty and Varela (1998) conducted in a content-based ESL classroom with the main aim of determining whether and how learners' attention can be drawn to formal features without impeding their original communicative purpose. Doughty and Varela operationalized implicit/incidental *focus on form* instruction as the use of corrective recasts.

Participants were from two different intact classes, thirty-four ESL students ranging from 11 to 14 years and studying at an intermediate level. They were divided into two groups, the *focus on form* (FonF) group (21) and the control (13), and participated in a series of science report tasks conducted in both written and oral modes. In the instructional period, which lasted over one month, participants in the FonF group participated in both group and teacher/student tasks during which, in addition to the science content instruction, the instructor provided corrective recasting comprising two phases: repetitions to draw attention and recasts to provide the contrastive forms. The control group received only the science content instruction. The targeted forms were the simple past and conditional tenses. The research design was a pretest, instruction, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest (after two months), corresponding to the first, fifth, and sixth report tasks. Attention was operationalized by learners' performances on these tasks.

Analyzing data comprising a combination of the targeted forms (past and conditional) collected on participants' transcribed oral and written science lab reports, Doughty and Varela found an overall, significant increase in both accuracy and total number of attempts at past time reference on both the oral and written tasks from the pretest to the posttests for the FonF group. The control group's performances remained relatively the same. For the delayed posttest, similar findings were found with the exception that it appears that the effects of focused recasting might not have been as robust in the written mode as it appeared to be in the oral mode. Based on these results, Doughty and Varela claim that providing appropriate and timely feedback in a sustained manner that did not impede with natural communication promoted learners' noticing of the conditional, which then contributed to their superior performance. However, as noted earlier, the role attention played in learners' actual processing of the targeted forms/structures was not empirically investigated nor were extraneous variables, such as out-of-class exposure, accounted for between posttests.

Although awareness was also not formally measured in the study, Doughty and Varela reported an apparent increased "awareness" of the targeted forms by the FonF group after a week or two of instruction. Some students were self-correcting before the teachers' recasts or were using corrective recasts to correct their peers. However, this observation was not elaborated in the report.

On the other hand, a looser interpretation of *focus on form* as any instruction or exposure that does not follow a focus of individual forms as a way of organizing language instruction allows more freedom in operationalizing *focus on form* from several perspectives. This has led to an inevitable debate over the degree of drawing learners' attention that is permissible in *focus on form*. Drawing learners' attention may range from being implicit/incidental (Long 1991; Long and Robinson 1998) to explicit[2] (DeKeyser 1998; Harley 1998; Lightbown 1998; Swain 1998) with several other interpretations that combine both implicit and explicit orientation falling between these two extremes (e.g., VanPatten and Cadierno 1993). This paper takes a broader view of *focus on form* to include any instructional treatment or exposure that in some way attempts to draw learners' attention to targeted forms/structures in the input or L2 data.

A review of studies conducted under an attentional framework reveals that the degree of *focus on form* is typically embedded in the instructional treatment or exposure that is claimed, in some way, to promote learners' attention to and subsequent noticing of targeted linguistic forms in the L2 data or input. On the implicit/incidental end are, for example, input flooding (Trahey 1996; Trahey and White 1993; Williams and Evans 1998) and written input enhancement (Alanen 1995; Jourdenais, Ota, Stauffer, Boyson, and Doughty 1995; Leow 1997b; Overstreet 1998; Shook 1994; J. White 1998). On the explicit end, for example, are implicit versus explicit learning conditions in both artificial (e.g., de Graaff 1997; DeKeyser 1995, 1997) and natural languages (N. Ellis 1993; Robinson 1995b, 1996, 1997a, 1997b; Rosa 1999; Rosa and O'Neill in press), processing instruction (Cadierno 1995; Cheng 1995; Collentine 1998; Sanz 1994; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993; VanPatten and Oikkenon 1996; VanPatten and Sanz 1995), explicit feedback (e.g., Carroll and Swain 1993; Lightbown and Spada 1990; Tomasello and Herron 1988, 1989; L. White 1991; L. White, Spada, Lightbown and Ranta 1991), and classroom-based tasks designed to draw learners' attention to forms (Fotos 1993, 1994; Fotos and Ellis 1991; Harley 1998; Leow 1998b; Rosa 1999; Rosa and O'Neill in press).

Implicit/Incidental End

A brief review of studies employing a more implicit approach to *focus on form* (e.g., input flooding) reveals unconvincing findings regarding the effectiveness of orienting learners' attention to targeted forms in the input (the intention being to have learners note these forms in the input). Williams and Evans (1998) investigated the effects of different *focus on form* instructional strategies (including input flooding that provided additional written input modified to provide substantial incidences of the targeted forms) on intermediate ESL learners' subsequent accuracy and use of English participial adjectives and the passive voice. They found, for one of the targeted forms (adjectival participles), no significant difference in performance between the input flood group and the control group on both a grammaticality judgment task and a sentence completion task. For the other targeted feature (the passive), they found a similar result for the narrative task but a significant difference on the sentence completion task. Trahey and L. White (1993) investigated the effects of a two-week input flood of materials containing English adverbs used naturalistically on 54 francophone participants' (average age, 11 years 2 months) preemption of their L1 parameter setting. While the results did indicate that participants responded to properties of the L2 input flood, they reported that input flooding did not serve to preempt the first language setting in this study.

Similarly, studies that have addressed the effects of written input enhancement on L2 learners' intake and production of targeted forms do not provide a strong justification for the use of such external manipulation of input to draw learners' attention to targeted features in the input. To enhance saliency, typographical cues, such as underlining, bolding, italicization, shading, or uppercase letters, have generally been employed. These studies have produced conflicting results. On the one hand, while Jourdenais et al. (1995) and Shook (1994) found some positive effects of written input enhancement, Jourdenais (1998), Leow (1997b), Overstreet (1998), and J. White (1998) did not find enhancing targeted forms successful in promoting further processing of targeted forms. Leow (1997b) concludes that the present evidence for positive effects of textual or written input enhancement designed to draw learners' attention to forms in the input is at best tenuous when compared to an absence of such enhancement. He suggests that

> *external manipulation may not have its desired effects due to methodological factors that need to be considered and tightly controlled, such as (1) the amount or level of attention learners pay to the enhanced forms; (2) the role of awareness in processing input into intake; (3) the amount of exposure to the enhanced forms; and (4) the potential variation of learners' overall L2 proficiency found in experimental cells (1997b, p. 164).*

Explicit End

Studies that have investigated the effects of *focus on form* of a more explicit nature have generally reported beneficial effects on learners' ability to notice targeted forms in the input. In both artificial and natural language studies, attempts were made to create learning conditions designed to address the effects of different types of instructional exposures. For example, in natural languages, N. Ellis (1993) investigated the following three types of instructional exposures: (1) explicit, operationalized as an explanation of the grammatical rule (soft mutation in Welsh), (2) implicit, operationalized as exposure to randomly ordered items of vocabulary in which the grammatical rule was present, and (3) structured, operationalized as the presentation of the grammatical rule followed by examples. Robinson's (1995b, 1996, 1997a, 1997b) learning conditions were manipulated to draw learners' attention to specific targeted structures (English subject/verb inversion in sentences with fronted adverbials and pseudoclefts of location) in the input. His four conditions were the following: (1) *implicit* in which learners were directed to memorize sentences that contained the targeted structures, (2) *incidental* in which learners were told to pay attention to content, (3) *rule search* in which learners were requested to find the underlying rules, and (4) *instructed* in which learners were provided with explicit instruction of the targeted structures. Rosa and O'Neill (in press) investigated the effects of a variety of external conditions premised on five degrees of explicitness based on a permutation of two variables: ± formal instruction and ± directions to search for rules. The findings of studies exploring the issue of explicit versus implicit learning conditions have strongly suggested that learners exposed to the explicit learning condition generally performed significantly better than those exposed to the implicit learning conditions.

Studies that have explored the effects of explicit grammatical explanation and negative feedback in ESL-intensive and French immersion programs in Canada have also generally reported a beneficial impact on learners' grammatical accuracy (e.g., Carroll and Swain 1993; Lightbown and Spada 1990; L. White 1991; L. White, Spada, Lightbown and Ranta 1991). L. White (1991) argues that the provision of explicit grammatical explanation and negative feedback is crucial in the L2 setting since they promote hypothesis testing and restructuring of learners' interlanguage. However, the researchers have suggested that caution be taken when interpreting these findings for the potential impact of several variables that were not controlled in the research designs.

In the adult L2 classroom, Tomasello and Herron's (1988, 1989) Garden Path technique (rooted in Nelson's 1987 cognitive-comparison model of language acquisition) also provides positive evidence for the provision of negative feedback. In these studies, participants were encouraged by the teacher first to produce orally an incorrect form by overgeneralizing a certain pattern and then were corrected by the teacher both orally and in writing (on the blackboard), followed by a grammatical explanation. Tomasello and Herron argue that negative feedback provided in a context where the focus is strictly on explicit grammatical instruction can affect learners' responses by helping learners to pay attention to the rule and its features, thereby reducing the effects of generalization (however, see Beck and Eubank 1991; Carroll, Roberge, and Swain 1992; Long 1996 for several critiques of this type of feedback).

Perhaps the most empirically supported type of instructional treatment conducted under a more explicit focus on attention to form is the so-called processing instruction (e.g., Cadierno 1995; Collentine 1998; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993; VanPatten and Oikkenon 1996; VanPatten and Sanz 1995). This type of instruction is defined as a grammatical explanation of a rule (in which learners' attention is explicitly oriented to what to pay attention to and why), immediately followed by structured activities to promote further processing of the input data. The effects of this instructional treatment have been empirically compared to traditional instruction (Cadierno 1995; Collentine 1998; DeKeyser and Solaski 1996; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993), defined as grammatical explanation and output practice of a grammatical point. It is hypothesized that the highlighting or saliency of targeted forms provided in processing instruction draws learners' attention to the targeted forms in the input, which may then be noticed by learners while engaging in subsequent meaning-based activities. Results have found no significant difference in performance on written production tasks between learners exposed to processing instruction and those exposed to traditional instruction. However, there are mixed results found for the interpretation task. While Cadierno (1995) and VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) reported that the processing group outperformed the traditional group on this task, Collentine (1998) did not find any significant difference in performance between the two groups. As Collentine pointed out, the different results may be due to the targeted forms (Spanish preterit and object pronouns versus Spanish subjunctive) or the traditional group's output-oriented tasks employed in the studies. In addition, both groups performed significantly better than the meaning-based group in all the studies, lending further support for the role of *focus on form* in the L2 classroom. (See VanPatten, this volume, for more on this topic.)

In an effort to tease out the differential effects of explicit grammatical explanation and structured activities, VanPatten and Oikkenon (1996) replicated VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) at a high-school level. Participants were placed into three groups: (1) regular processing instruction, (2) explanation only, and (3) structured activities only. They found that the groups exposed to regular processing instruction only and structured activities only performed significantly better on both the interpretation and production tasks when compared to the explanation only group. VanPatten and Oikkenon argue for the importance of carefully structured activities designed to draw learners' attention to targeted forms while downplaying the role of grammatical explanation in isolation.

The beneficial effects of activities/tasks are also found in studies that have specifically employed tasks to draw learners' attention to specific linguistic forms or information. These tasks range from explicit metalinguistic discussion (Fotos and Ellis 1991; Fotos 1993, 1994) to implicit presentation with explicit orientation (Leow 1998b). This line of investigation is based on the claim that task-based instruction/exposure also contributes to language learning by drawing learners' attention to crucial grammatical information in the input (e.g., Long 1991; Long and Crookes 1993; Nunan 1989, 1993).

Tasks that have been designed to promote consciousness raising of L2 learners' grammatical information (Fotos 1993, 1994; Fotos and Ellis 1991) have relied heavily on dyads and group work that have focused more on learners' cognitive understanding than on acquisition. A typical task described in Fotos and Ellis (1991) contains four task cards listing grammatical and ungrammatical sentences that illustrate the use of dative verbs and specify the grammatical accuracy of each sentence and a task sheet that provides basic grammatical and metalinguistic information concerning dative verbs. The task sheet also includes a chart that participants fill out with the information. Participants are instructed to discuss among themselves the formulation of rules concerning dative verbs. The effects of this type of task have been empirically compared to more traditional instruction (usually defined as centered on the teacher who provides explicit explanation of the grammatical point—e.g., adverb and indirect object placements and relativization—under investigation and meaning-based instruction). Results generally indicated no difference in performance between the consciousness-raising group and the traditional group. In some instances the latter group outperformed the consciousness-raising group, for example, in delayed tasks (Fotos and Ellis 1991) and amount of noticing of targeted forms (Fotos 1993). However, both types of instruction performed significantly better than the meaning-based instruction (see Doughty and Williams 1998 for critiques of this type of instruction). Noticing in the 1993 study was operationalized by learners' underlining targeted forms in a written text.

Harley (1998) investigated the effects of *focus on form* tasks on young learners' (7–8 years old) development of grammatical gender in French. Tasks chosen for their design to orient learners' attention to gender were those that required the naming of individual concrete objects such as in the games I spy, Simon says, bingo, concentration, and my aunt's suitcase. During these games, participants were also explicitly encouraged to identify the phonological, orthographic, and morphological cues that assign gender to an object. Harley found that while the experimental group performed significantly better than the control group, "item" learning appeared to be more promoted than "system learning." She also found that significant improved performance by the experimental group was maintained on a delayed posttest administered six months later. Attention was operationalized by learners' performance on the postexposure tasks.

Leow (1998b) used a problem-solving task (a crossword puzzle) in which learners' attention was explicitly drawn to a mismatch between the correct targeted forms and incorrect forms induced by learners' prior knowledge of the regular verbal paradigm of Spanish preterit. A key characteristic of this task was Loschky and Bley-Vroman's (1993) notion of "task-essentialness" that required learners to pay attention to the targeted grammatical forms in order to complete the task successfully. The effect of this type of instructional exposure, called learner-centered, was contrasted with a teacher-centered exposure defined as the "use of instructional strategies to draw the learners' attention to the form(s) or structure(s) presented by the teacher" (Leow 1998b, p. 51). Investigating the effects of amount (single vs. multiple) and type (teacher-centered vs. learner-centered) on 88 adult learners' L2 morphological development, Leow found that both learner-centered and multiple exposures contributed significantly to learners' ability to take in and produce in writing morphological forms when compared to single and teacher-centered exposures. These superior performances were maintained on both posttests administered three weeks and fourteen weeks after the instructional treatment/exposure period.

One striking finding was the learner-centered group's superiority over the teacher-centered group on all posttests. Both groups had been alerted and oriented to the targeted forms either by the teacher or by the task instructions, and both had significantly increased their scores from the pretest. Leow attributed the significant difference between the two groups on the immediate posttest to the amount of attention at the level of noticing. In other words, while the experimental task itself dictated the degree of attention to be paid to the targeted forms in order to complete it successfully, the role attention played in the teacher-centered group still remains speculative. In such an instructional treatment, in spite of efforts to alert and orient learners' attention to targeted forms, there is no evidence to indicate that all of the learners were cognitively registering or even paying attention to the forms.

Studies that Have Investigated the Role of Awareness in L2 Development

Relatively few empirical studies have directly addressed the role of awareness in L2 development in the L2 classroom. Some *focus on form* studies have made indirect references to the role of awareness (e.g., Doughty and Varela 1998; Jourdenais et al. 1995; Leeman, Arteagoitia, Fridman, and Doughty 1995) although this construct was not operationalized or measured. Other studies have made direct attempts to operationalize and measure awareness in their research designs, employing off-line procedures such as debriefing postexposure questionnaires (Robinson 1995b, 1996, 1997a, 1997b), on-line procedures such as think-aloud protocols (e.g., Leow 1997a; Rosa 1999; Rosa and O'Neill in press), or a combination of both on-line (think-aloud protocols) and off-line (grammaticality judgment task and rule-statement test) procedures (Alanen 1995). Because on-line procedures produce more robust data with respect to the role of awareness during interaction with the input or L2 data, only studies that have employed think-aloud protocols as a measurement tool of awareness will be presented.

Leow (1997a) quantitatively and qualitatively addressed the role of awareness in foreign language behavior at a morphological level in relation to Schmidt's noticing hypothesis. He first undertook to establish that noticing did indeed occur before attempting to address the role of levels of awareness and their effects on L2 behavior. Awareness in this study was based on Tomlin and Villa's (1994) restricted definition and Allport's (1988) criteria for the presence of awareness: (a) a show of some behavioral or cognitive change (e.g., verbal or written production of the stem change of the targeted form) due to the experience and (b) a report of being aware of the experience or (c) some form of metalinguistic description of the underlying rule. Leow analyzed the think-aloud protocols produced by twenty-eight adult beginning learners of Spanish who were required to complete a problem-solving task (a crossword puzzle) and their immediate performances on two postexposure tasks designed to elicit recognition and written production of the targeted forms—the "irregular" third person singular and plural preterit forms of stem-changing -*ir* verbs in Spanish. From the analysis of the think-alouds he identified three levels of awareness: [+ cognitive change, – meta-awareness, – morphological rule formation] where participants did not provide a report of their subjective experience nor did they verbalize any rule; [+ cognitive change, + meta-awareness, – morphological rule formation] where participants did report their subjective experience but did not provide any verbalization of the rule; and [+ cognitive change, + meta-awareness, + morphological rule formation] where participants provided both a report and a verbalization of rule formation (similar to Schmidt's 1995, p. 29 notion of understanding that is a higher level of awareness).

His findings led to three conclusions: First, he found that meta-awareness appeared to correlate with an increased usage of hypothesis testing and morphological rule formation (conceptually driven processing), while absence of meta-awareness appeared to correlate with an absence of such processing. Second, the findings indicated that more awareness contributed to more recognition and accurate production of the noticed forms by facilitating or enhancing further processing of such forms contained in the L2 data. One consequence of this increased allocation of attention could have contributed to learners' more effective intake and immediate retrieval of noticed forms when compared to less awareness at this level. Finally, the findings provided empirical support for the facilitative effects of awareness on foreign language behavior.

Rosa and O'Neill (in press) extended Leow's (1997a) line of investigation by exploring the role of awareness at a syntactic level, namely, on learners' intake of Spanish conditional sentences in the context of a problem-solving task. Sixty-seven participants were randomly assigned to five different conditions premised on five degrees of explicitness (a combination of ± formal instruction and ± directions to search for rules). Intake was measured by learners' performance on a multiple-choice recognition administered immediately after the experimental task. Like Leow (1997a), concurrent think-aloud protocols were used to establish different levels of awareness. Rosa and O'Neill found results similar to Leow's (1997a) study: While both awareness at the level of noticing and understanding contributed substantially to a significant increase in learners' ability to take in the targeted structure, awareness at the level of understanding also had a differential impact on the amount of intake when compared to awareness at the level of noticing.

Rosa (1999) expanded Rosa and O'Neill's study (in press) to include novel exemplars, a written production task, and delayed posttests. Using a computerized task, she found corroborating evidence for the overall facilitative effect of awareness (at both the level of noticing and understanding) on L2 learning. Likewise, higher levels of awareness (i.e., understanding) proved to be more effective than lower levels (i.e, noticing).

The overall findings from these studies indicate a strong role for awareness in L2 development and that as the level of awareness increases, there appears to be a corresponding improvement in learners' performances. The studies also revealed that several participants, irrespective of experimental condition with different instructions, demonstrated similar levels of awareness. For example, Robinson found in a postexposure questionnaire that several participants in his implicit learning condition demonstrated awareness, even at the level of understanding. Similar findings were found in Alanen (1995) and Rosa and O'Neill (in press) participants' think-aloud protocols gathered on-line while completing a task.

The roles of attention and awareness in L2 learning are, without doubt, areas of investigation that warrant further empirical research in the classroom setting. The present challenges to SLA researchers are to test further the current approaches presented earlier and to improve the operationalization of both attention and what constitutes awareness in L2 learning in the experiments conducted in the classroom setting. As pointed out by Leow (1998a), due to the research design of most of these studies in which attention was operationalized as performance on postexposure tasks, only claims can be made on the actual role attention or awareness played in learners' performances after instructional treatment or exposure. These challenges may necessitate the use of both on-line and immediate off-line data collection as far as is permissible under the conditions of the research designs. In addition, while it is accepted that some form of attention should be paid to formal features in the foreign language classroom, there are several areas of research that warrant future research. These areas include the selection of forms, the presentation of forms, and the timing of forms, together with curricular decisions with respect to *focus on form* instruction (see Chapter 10 in Doughty and Williams [1998] for a thorough discussion of these issues), and the role of individual learning styles.

Suggestions for the Classroom Teacher

Based on the review of both theoretical and empirical evidence as presented earlier, several suggestions may be made. First of all, the crucial role that attention plays in subsequent processing of incoming input, that is, L2 development, is generally accepted by both theorists and researchers. The present overview of studies that have addressed in some way the effects of *focus on form* also strongly suggests that explicit *focus on form* provides an overall benefit for faster learning and higher levels of performances when compared to lack of exposure to this type of instructional treatment or exposure. In other words, the findings suggest that efforts, such as input flooding and written input enhancement to draw learners' attention implicitly to targeted forms in the input may not be as successful as those efforts that explicitly do so, for example, explicit learning conditions and classroom-based tasks designed to draw learners' attention to forms. Explicitly drawing learners' attention to targeted forms through the creation of explicit conditions, exposure, or instruction appears to promote the allocation of more attentional resources to notice such forms that may be potentially overlooked by the learners. This approach incorporates the notions of L2 learners' limited attentional resources and the low salience of specific linguistic forms or structures that are routinely encountered in the L2 data.

Second, in addition to attempting to draw learners' attention explicitly to form in the input, it is also suggested that careful consideration be made in designing pedagogical tasks that learners perform in the classroom. The findings suggest that classroom tasks or activities designed to promote noticing of targeted forms during instructional exposure to L2 data or while engaging in meaningful interaction facilitates learners' orientation to and potential noticing of targeted linguistic forms in the input. Indeed, it appears that these tasks must be carefully designed not only to promote learners' attention to the targeted forms in the input or L2 data but also to be robust enough to warrant noticing of the forms (see Leow 1998b).

Third, preliminary findings on the role of awareness in L2 development indicate that, in addition to the facilitative role of awareness at the level of noticing in further processing of L2 data, higher levels of awareness (that is, understanding) translate into more learning. Since raising one's awareness of linguistic forms or structures is more an internal process than an external one, it is suggested that computerized or individualized tasks be included in the classroom and/or laboratory activities. These are tasks in which learners need to notice (and perhaps understand the underlying rules of) the targeted form or structure in order to complete the task successfully.

Conclusion

This paper has presented an overview of the theoretical issues surrounding the roles of attention and awareness in adult language learning; it then provided a brief, critical summary of studies that have in some way attempted to investigate empirically their roles in the foreign language classroom. As pointed out, more robust research designs are certainly warranted in future studies exploring these crucial aspects of L2 development while other theoretically driven alternatives to current instructional proposals are also warranted. Current research findings are promising; and, hopefully, as we increase our understanding of the processes involved in language learning, we will become more aware of the variables that contribute to language learning and teaching and pay attention to the instructional procedures we use in the formal classroom.

Notes

1. Leow notes that the question of whether the presence of awareness at the level of detection was crucial for further processing to take place was not an issue in this study. The focus was on the differential effects of Tomlin and Villa's three attentional functions motivated by the coarse-grained versus fine-grained approaches to the study of attention in SLA.
2. It should be noted that Doughty and Williams (1998) reject any explicit explanation of formal knowledge that is not immediately followed by activities along the lines of their *focus on form* instruction with signals and brief interventions (p. 250). This distinction would appear to eliminate from Doughty and Williams' definition of *focus on form* instructional, task-based approaches such as consciousness-raising (Fotos and Ellis 1991; Fotos 1993, 1994) and processing instruction (e.g., Cadierno 1995; Collentine 1998; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993; VanPatten and Oikkenon 1996; VanPatten and Sanz 1995), and the Garden Path technique (Tomasello and Herron 1988, 1989), together with more recent studies that investigated on-line processes to address empirically the effects of attention and awareness on language learning (e.g., Leow 1997a, 1998a, 1998b; Rosa 1999; Rosa and O'Neill in press).

Works Cited

Alanen, Riika. 1995. Input Enhancement and Rule Presentation in Second Language Acquisition. In *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, edited by Richard W. Schmidt, 259–302. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Allport, A. 1988. What Concept of Consciousness? In *Consciousness in Contemporary Science*, edited by Anthony J. Marcel and E. Bisiach, 159–182. London: Clarendon Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen, and Beverly Hartford. 1997. *Beyond Methods: Components of Second Language Teacher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Beck, M., and Lynn Eubank. 1991. Acquisition Theory and Experimental Design: A Critique of Tomasello and Herron. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13: 73–76.

Bialystok, Eileen. 1978. A Theoretical Model of Second Language Acquisition. *Language Learning* 28: 69–84.

______. 1990. The Competence of Processing: Classifying Theories of Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 24: 635–648.

______. 1994. Analysis and Control in the Development of Second Language Proficiency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 157–168.

Cadierno, Teresa. 1995. Formal Instruction from a Processing Perspective: An Investigation into the Spanish Past Tense. *Modern Language Journal* 79: 179–193.

Carr, Thomas H., and Tim Curran. 1994. Cognitive Factors in Learning about Structured Sequences: Applications to Syntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 205–230.

Carroll, Susanne, and Merrill Swain. 1993. Explicit and Implicit Negative Feedback: An Empirical Study of the Learning of Linguistic Generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 357–386.

Carroll, Susan, Yves Roberge, and Merrill Swain. 1992. The Role of Feedback in Adult Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 13: 173–198.

Cheng, An-Chung. 1995. Grammar Instruction and Input Processing: The Acquisition of Spanish *ser* and *estar*. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collentine, Joseph. 1998. Processing Instruction and the Subjunctive. *Hispania* 81: 576–587.

Curran, Tim, and Steven W. Keele. 1993. Attentional and Nonattentional Forms of Sequence Learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition* 19: 189–202.

de Graaff, Rick. 1997. The eXperanto Experiment: Effects of Explicit Instruction on Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 249–297.

DeKeyser, Robert M. 1995. Learning Second Language Grammar Rules: An Experiment with a Miniature Linguistic System. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 17: 379–410.

_______. 1997. Beyond Explicit Rule Learning: Automatizing Second Language Morphosyntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 196–221.

_______. 1998. Beyond Focus on Form: Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing Second Language Grammar. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 42–63. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

DeKeyser, Robert M., and Karl J. Solaski. 1996. The Differential Role of Comprehension and Production. *Language Learning* 46: 613–642.

Doughty, Catherine. 1991. Second Language Instruction Does Make a Difference. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13: 431–469.

Doughty, Catherine, and Elizabeth Varela. 1998. Communicative Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 114–138. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams. 1998. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, Nick. 1993. Rules and Instances in Foreign Language Learning: Interactions of Explicit and Implicit Knowledge. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 5: 289–319.

Ellis, Rod. 1993. The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 27: 91–113.

Fotos, Sandra S. 1993. Consciousness Raising and Noticing through Focus on Form: Grammar Task Development Versus Formal Instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 14: 385–407.

______. 1994. Integrating Grammar Instruction and Communicative Language Use through Grammar Consciousness-raising Tasks. *TESOL Quarterly* 28: 323–351.

Fotos, Sandra, and Rod Ellis. 1991. Communicating about Grammar: A Task-based Approach. *TESOL Quarterly* 25: 605–628.

Gass, Susan M. 1988. Integrating Research Areas: A Framework for Second Language Studies. *Applied Linguistics* 9: 198–217.

Hardcastle, Valerie Gray. 1993. The Naturalists vs. the Skeptics: The Debate over a Scientific Understanding of Consciousness. *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 14: 27–50.

Harley, Birgit. 1992. Patterns of Second Language Development in French Immersion. *Journal of French Language Studies* 2: 159–183.

______. 1998. The Role of Focus on Form Tasks in Promoting Child L2 Acquisition. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 156–174. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, Birgit, and Merrill Swain. 1984. The Interlanguage of Immersion Students and Its Implications for Second Language Teaching. In *Interlanguage*, edited by Alan Davies, C. Criper, and A. Howatt, 291–311. Edinburgh, Scot.: Edinburgh University Press.

Hulstijn, Jan H. 1989. Implicit and Incidental Second Language Learning: Experiments in the Processing of Natural and Partially Artificial Input. In *Interlingual Processes*, edited by Hans W. Dechert and Manfred Raupach, 49–73. Tübingen, Ger.: Narr.

Hulstijn, Jan H., and Richard W. Schmidt. 1994. Guest Editors' Introduction. *AILA Review* 11: 5–10.

Jordenais, Renée. 1998. The Effects of Textual Enhancement on the Acquisition of the Spanish Preterit and Imperfect. Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University.

Jourdenais, Renée, Mitsuhiko Ota, Stephanie Stauffer, Beverly Boyson, and Catherine Doughty. 1995. Does Textual Enhancement Promote Noticing?: A Think Aloud Protocol Analysis. In *Attention and Awareness* *in Foreign Language Learning*, edited by Richard W. Schmidt, 183–216. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Kahneman, Daniel. 1973. *Attention and Effort.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford, NY: Pergamon.

Leeman, Jennifer, Igone Arteagoitia, Boris Fridman, and Catherine Doughty. 1995. Integrating Attention to Form with Meaning: Focus on Form in Content-based Spanish Instruction. In *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, edited by Richard W. Schmidt, 217–258. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Leow, Ronald P. 1993. To Simplify or Not to Simplify: A Look at Intake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 333–355.

______. 1994a. Teacher Education and Coherent Curriculum Development: The Crucial Link. In *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication and Global Interdependence*, edited by James E. Alatis, 337–346. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

______. 1994b. The Role of TAs in Coherent Language Curriculum Development. *The Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development* 2: 63–70.

______. 1995a. Professional TA Development and Coherent Curriculum Development: Preparing TAs for the Future Professoriate. In *Teaching Graduate Students to Teach: Engaging the Disciplines*, edited by T. Keenan and K. Jerich, 41–44. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Office of Conferences and Institutes Press.

______. 1995b. Teacher Education and Psycholinguistics: Making Teachers Psycholinguists. In *Linguistics and the Education of Second Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistics, Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistic Aspects*, edited by James E. Alatis, Carolyn A. Straehle, Brent Gallenberger, and Margaret Ronkin, 361–377. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

______. 1995c. Modality and Intake in Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 17: 79–89.

______. 1997a. Attention, Awareness, and Foreign Language Behavior. *Language Learning* 47: 467–506.

______. 1997b. The Effects of Input Enhancement and Text Length on Adult L2 Readers' Comprehension and Intake in Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Language Learning* 8: 151–182.

______. 1998a. Toward Operationalizing the Process of Attention in SLA: Evidence for Tomlin and Villa's (1994) Fine-grained Analysis of Attention. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 19: 133–159.

______. 1998b. The Effects of Amount and Type of Exposure on Adult Learners' L2 Development in SLA. *Modern Language Journal* 82: 49–68.

Lightbown, Patsy M. 1998. The Importance of Timing in Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 177–196. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, Patsy M., and Nina Spada. 1990. Focus on Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on Second Language Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 429–448.

Long, Michael H. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*, edited by Kees de Bot, Ralph B. Ginsberg, and Claire Kramsch, 39–52. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

______. 1996. The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. In *Handbook on Research in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia, 413–468. New York: Academic.

Long, Michael H., and Graham Crookes. 1993. Units of Analysis in Syllabus Design: The Case for Task. In *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 9–54. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Long, Michael H., and Peter Robinson. 1998. Focus on Form: Theory, Research and Practice. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 15–41. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Loschky, Lester, and Bley-Vroman, R. 1993. Grammar and Task-based Methodology. In *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 123–167. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Nelson, K. 1987. Some Observations from the Perspective of the Rare Event Cognitive Comparison Theory of Language Acquisition. In *Children's Language* vol. 6, edited by Keith E. Nelson and Ann van Kleek, 289–331. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nunan, David. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

______. 1993. Task-based Syllabus Design: Selecting, Grading and Sequencing Tasks. In *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice,* edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 55–68. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Overstreet, Mark H. 1998. Text Enhancement and Content Familiarity: The Focus of Learner Attention. *Spanish Applied Linguistics* 2: 229–258.

Pica, Teresa. 1994. Research on Negotiation: What Does It Reveal about Second Language Acquisition? *Language Learning* 44: 493–527.

Robinson, Peter. 1995a. Review Article: Attention, Memory, and the Noticing Hypothesis. *Language Learning* 45: 283–331.

______. 1995b. Aptitude, Awareness and the Fundamental Similarity of Implicit and Explicit Second Language Learning. In *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning,* edited by Richard W. Schmidt, 303–358. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

______. 1996. Learning Simple and Complex Second Language Rules under Implicit, Incidental, Rule-search and Instructed Conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 27–68.

______. 1997a. Generalizability and Automaticity of Second Language Learning under Implicit, Incidental, Enhanced, and Instructed Conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 223–247.

______. 1997b. Individual Differences and the Fundamental Similarity of Implicit and Explicit Adult Second Language Learning. *Language Learning* 47: 45–99.

Rosa, Elena. 1999. A Cognitive Approach to Task-based Research: Explicitness, Awareness, and L2 Development. Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University.

Rosa, Elena, and Michael O'Neill. In press. Explicitness, Intake, and the Issue of Awareness: Another Piece to the Puzzle. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21.

Sanz, Cristina. 1994. Multiple Assessment of an Input-based Approach to Explicit Instruction in Grammar. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Schmidt, Richard W. 1990. The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11: 129–158.

______. 1993. Awareness and Second Language Acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13: 206–226.

______. 1994. Deconstructing Consciousness in Search of Useful Definitions for Applied Linguistics. *AILA Review* 11: 11–26.

______. 1995. Consciousness and Foreign Language Learning: A Tutorial on the Role of Attention and Awareness in Learning. In *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, edited by Richard W. Schmidt, 1–63. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Sharwood Smith, Michael. 1981. Consciousness-raising and the Second Language Learner. *Applied Linguistics* 2: 159–169.

______. 1986. Comprehension versus Acquisition: Two Ways of Processing Input. *Applied Linguistics* 7: 239–274.

______. 1991. Speaking to Many Minds: On the Relevance of Different Types of Language Information for the L2 Learner. *Second Language Research* 17: 118–136.

______. 1993. Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical Bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 165–180.

Shook, David J. 1994. FL/L2 Reading, Grammatical Information, and the Input-to-Intake Phenomenon. *Applied Language Learning* 5: 57–93.

Swain, Merrill. 1998. Focus on Form through Conscious Reflection. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 64–81. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tomasello, Michael, and Carol Herron. 1988. Down the Garden Path: Inducing and Correcting Overgeneralization Errors in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 9: 237–246.

______. 1989. Feedback for Language Transfer Errors: The Garden Path Technique. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11: 385–395.

Tomlin, Russell S., and Victor Villa. 1994. Attention in Cognitive Science and Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 183–203.

Trahey, Martha. 1996. Positive Evidence and Preemption in Second Language Acquisition: Some Long-term Effects. *Second Language Research* 12: 111–139.

Trahey, Martha, and Lydia White. 1993. Positive Evidence and Preemption in the Second Language Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 181–203.

VanPatten, Bill. 1990. Attending to Form and Content in the Input: An Experiment in Consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 287–301.

______. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

VanPatten, Bill, and Teresa Cadierno. 1993. Input Processing and Second Language Acquisition: A Role for Instruction. *Modern Language Journal* 77: 45–57.

VanPatten, Bill, and Soile Oikkenon. 1996. Explanation Versus Structured Input in Processing Instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 495–510.

VanPatten, Bill, and Cristina Sanz. 1995. From Input to Output: Processing Instruction and Communicative Tasks. In *Second Language Acquisition: Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Fred R. Eckman, Diane Highland, Peter W. Lee, Jean Mileham, and Rita Rutkowski Weber, 169–185. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Velmans, Max. 1991. Is Human Information Processing Conscious? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 14: 651–669.

White, Joanna. 1998. Getting the Learners' Attention: A Typographical Input Enhancement Study. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 85–113. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

White, Lydia. 1991. Adverb Placement in Second Language Acquisition: Some Effects of Positive and Negative Evidence in the Classroom. *Second Language Research* 7: 133–161.

White, Lydia, Nina M. Spada, Patsy M. Lightbown, and Leila Ranta. 1991. Input Enhancement and Second Language Question Formation. *Applied Linguistics* 4: 416–432.

Wickens, Christopher D. 1980. The Structure of Attentional Resources. In *Attention and Performance VIII*, edited by Raymond S. Nickerson, 239–257. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

______. 1984. Processing Resources in Attention. In *Varieties of Attention*, edited by Raja Parasuraman and D. Davies, 63–98. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

______. 1989. Attention and Skilled Performance. In *Human Skills*. 2nd ed., edited by Dennis H. Holding, 71–105. New York: John Wiley.

Williams, Jessica, and Jacqueline Evans. 1998. What Kind of Focus and on Which Forms? In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 139–155. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

PART II

The Teaching Context for Focus on Form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLASSROOM TALK: FORM, MEANING, AND ACTIVITY THEORY

Celeste Kinginger
The Pennsylvania State University

* * *

> *Thomas: ... les phrases ne peuvent pas présenter un sens complet tout en étant vides de sens.*
>
> *Dick: Vous nous créez des difficultés. Si vous ne voulez pas faire des phrases avec les mots que vous devez apprendre aujourd'hui, je vous donnerai une mauvaise note.*
>
> *Thomas: Bien, Dick, je vais essayer. Le pupitre est dans le cahier. Le professeur est dans la poche du gilet de la montre. Le tableau noir écrit la copie sur le maitre...*
>
> —Ionesco 1974

> *Subject: Abdurakhm., age thirty-seven, from remote Kashgar village, illiterate.*
>
> *The following syllogism is presented:*
>
> *In the Far North, where there is snow, all bears are white. Novaya Zemlya is in the Far North and there is always snow there. What color are the bears there?*
>
> Subject: There are different sorts of bears.
>
> *Failure to infer from syllogism.*
>
> The syllogism is repeated.
>
> Subject: I don't know; I've seen a black bear, I've never seen any others . . . Each locality has its own animals: if it's white, they will be white; if it's yellow, they will be yellow.
>
> *Appeals only to personal, graphic experience.*
>
> *But what kind of bears are there in Novaya Zemlya?*
>
> Subject: We always speak only of what we see; we don't talk about what we haven't seen.
>
> *The same.*
>
> *But what do my words imply?*
>
> *The syllogism is repeated.*
>
> Subject: Well, it's like this: our tzar isn't like yours, and yours isn't like ours. Your words can be answered only by someone who was there, and if a person wasn't there he can't say anything on the basis of your words.
>
> *The same.*
>
> *But on the basis of my words—in the North, where there is always snow, the bears are white, can you gather what kind of bears there are in Novaya Zemlya?*
>
> Subject: If a man was sixty or eighty and had seen a white bear and had told about it, he could be believed, but I've never seen one and hence I can't say.
>
> —Luria 1976, pp. 108–109

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Everyone—both within the literature and far removed from it—notes that classroom discourse is peculiar. Historically, foreign language educators have focused less on the socially situated mediational nature, that is, the cultural meaning underlying its singular peculiarity, than on achieving quantifiably assessable and exportable strategies for reforming the classroom. These typically include cunning or elaborate strategies to naturalize the talk that takes place there. Even with reforms fully in place, however, classroom talk remains, even in the best of times, occasionally absurd, somewhat inauthentic and artificial.

In positing a need for research on the socially and historically situated reasons why classroom talk is so peculiar, this paper invokes some sociohistorical influences on speech in classrooms, emphasizing in particular the category of discourse that is usually associated with focus on form.

To clarify the sociocultural reasons why classroom talk presents manifest peculiarities requires a change in analytical stance: Analyses of classroom discourse are typically performed in an ahistorical, socially isolated way. The features of classroom talk may be exhaustively described, but, without research into or reference to their origins, they cannot be adequately explained. When the implicit rules of classroom talk are not linked to broader social categories, their significance to learners is poorly understood and frequently underestimated.

In the implicitly shared value and belief system of language researchers and teachers, such hidden rules may be construed as impermanent, insubstantial, and susceptible of technical abatement or modification. In applied research, solutions to the problem—or milestones on the path leading to solutions—are to be proposed: technical recommendations for broadening classroom discourse options. These are typically grounded in a panoptic social view according to which classroom activity is centrally controlled, either by the persona of the teacher or in tasks devised and distributed by the teacher.

In fact, research rather suggests that teachers and materials developers may and do propose tasks, but those tasks are interpreted and carried out by learners according to their own criteria: Both control of the classroom and definition or negotiation of the meaning of tasks are inherently socially distributed among all the participants. Within our pragmatic tradition of applied research as problem solving, this paper offers no new technical solutions. Rather, it argues that in observing foreign language classroom discourse, invoking socially embedded actions and histories may lead us to understand better the nature and meaning of learners' classroom talk.

The Search for Context

Educational linguistics has in recent years moved toward increased scrutiny of the complex relationship that obtains among learning, ideological motivation, and participation in socially situated discourse. Analyses of linguistic phenomena are frequently linked to categories used by social theorists. These movements occur within a broad trend toward legitimizing social theory within linguistics (Gee 1990; Fairclough 1995). This trend was evidenced during a recent plenary address by Courtney Cazden (1998), situated in comments on changes that have occurred in the commonly accepted meanings of the term "discourse."

Within linguistics, orthodox discourse analysis has traditionally concerned itself with the structural organization of naturally occurring samples of language use. In recent years, however, following Gee (1990), the term "discourse" has come to refer to: (1) broader categories of socially situated meaning, so-called "constellations of repeated meanings" (Stubbs 1996, p. 158 as cited in Cazden 1998, p. 12); or (2) "ways of understanding" (Cazden 1998, p. 11). The latter emerge from histories of participation in particular kinds of institutionally sanctioned language use and are linked to explicit or implicit ideological stances. Cazden accordingly categorizes approaches to discourse along two lines: Discourse that is principally concerned with naturally occurring language use, or *Discourse 1;* and discourse that analyzes "ways of understanding," or *Discourse 2.*

In parallel with Fairclough (1995), Cazden notes that there is rich potential in studying the interaction between Discourse 1, traditionally the purview of linguistics, and Discourse 2, traditionally the focus of social theory. These two categories, in fact, constitute a dyadic system, wherein the two forms of discourse are mutually constitutive: Ways of talking construct ways of understanding, and they are also engendered by them.

The importance of this kind of analysis for understanding classroom language use is illustrated in the work of Wertsch (1990). Wertsch has pointed out the ways in which the "voice of decontextualized rationality" is accorded a privileged status, both in formal schooling and more generally throughout modern society. That predominant voice, intimately associated with modes of rational Enlightenment discourse, such as utilitarianism, accompanied the rise of literacy in Europe. Yet it is often accorded the status of a "primordial existence that underlies our ability to use language in discourse" (Wertsch 1990, p. 120). As Scribner and Cole (1981) have demonstrated, much of the activity taking place in schools is related to mastering the discourse of rational decontextualized representation. Rational discourse in school is indeed a "way of understanding" that can be characterized, in Cazden's taxonomy, as a Discourse 2. This paper explores the mutually constitutive relationship between this Discourse 2 (abstract rationality) and samples of naturally occurring speech and writing in the foreign language classroom (Discourse 1).

Theoretical Background

Explaining the mutually constitutive interrelation between Discourse 1 and Discourse 2 has long been a goal of Vygotskian sociocultural theory. As summarized by Wertsch, "the task of Vygotsky's sociocultural approach to mind was to specify how human mental functioning reflects and constitutes its historical, institutional, and cultural setting" (Wertsch 1990, p. 115). Vygotskian theory makes two specific and powerful claims about the fundamental nature of the Discourse 1/Discourse 2 relationship: (1) that higher mental functions in the individual have their origins in social life, and therefore the origin of thought is to be sought in the external, historical, and social forms of human activity; and (2) that in analyzing mental functioning, semiotic mediation should be assigned primacy: Higher mental function assumes form mediated by tools and signs and cannot be understood or meaningfully discussed apart from them.

Within sociocultural theory, activity theory analyzes the "why," "what," and "how" of participants' activity. The specific task of activity theory (Leont'ev 1981) is to examine the genesis and relevance of motives for mental activity. According to Lantolf and Appel (1994, p. 21), "human sociocultural activity that gives rise to higher forms of cognition, is comprised of contextual, intentional, and circumstantial dimensions." For language research, this kind of analysis provides links—via semiotic systems, especially language—between the institutionally and socioculturally defined motives of participants and their concrete actions and operations; that is, between Discourse 2 (which encompasses ways of understanding) and Discourse 1 (which comprises naturally occurring language use in a particular setting).

Activity theory replaces the individual as locus of development (and inquiry, within experimental research) with an analysis of activity defined as purposeful social action in context (Leont'ev 1981; Lantolf and Appel 1994). As Lantolf and Pavlenko (1995) remind us, activity theory is not so much interested in explaining the *causes* of behavior as in explicating the *dispositions* people adopt toward mental activity under certain conditions. Thus in the foreign language classroom, teachers' assignments and directives do not directly compel learners to behave in specified ways; rather, because mental activity is always goal-directed, learners do respond, but they clearly do so according to social predispositions arising from sociohistorically generated motives. These motives certainly include ingratiating themselves with teachers (or otherwise) for culturally apparent reasons, but they equally include motives such as a broad, implicit, and frequently conflictual understanding about the meaning of school (Tharp and Gallimore 1988), and, by extension, of *schoolwork*.

Motives are associated with participation in Discourse 2s; they are "culturally constructed and validated discourses that organize our world according to certain meanings and not others" (Lantolf and Pavlenko 1995, p. 110). The formation of motives is thus crucially dependent upon the kinds of access people have, and have had in the past, to particular semiotic resources, and these resources, as Wertsch (1998) states, offer both affordances and constraints. According to Harré and Gilette:

> *Ultimately there will be customary and widely endorsed practices that do, in fact, constrain someone in that he or she is an agent with a certain historical, cultural, and mental position; these will both form the person and influence what he or she can become (Harré and Gilette 1994, p. 122).*

Text-Based Realities: Form and Meaning within Rational Discourse Processes

In *Negotiating Sense in the Zone of Proximal Development,* Wertsch and Minnick (1990) attempt to synthesize and correlate observations from social theories of modern life with accounts of psychological and developmental discourse in schools. Specifically, following Weber and Habermas, they note the ubiquity of rationality as "a criterial feature of modern human consciousness" (Wertsch and Minnick 1990, p. 72). This is reflected in its status as "a dominant, privileged mode of thinking and speaking in formal schooling" (p. 85). The classical activities of schooled learning form instances of *rational discourse*, a way of speaking that is mutually constitutive with the institutional organization of modern society. Both manifest the "fixed, unquestioned goals, technical rules, context-free language, and problem-solving orientation" characteristic of rational discourse (p. 72).

As Wertsch and Minnick (1990) demonstrate in their observation of the socialization of children in schools, it is possible to forge a link between the institutional presence of rational discourse and its impact on psychological processes. A precedent for this work exists in early studies carried out by Vygotsky (1978) and Luria (1976). Within the context of early Soviet efforts to built a modern technological society, Vygotsky and Luria had attempted to document society's evolution by tracing individuals' routes as they ascended to "higher-level" mental functioning—to "scientific" (Vygotsky 1978) or "academic" (Luria 1976) concepts.

As a mode of discourse, Wertsch and Minnick (1990) view rationality as a language or voice (Discourse 2) whose classroom uses (Discourse 1) can be identified. Children are encouraged to adopt rationality during the literacy practices of formal schooling. Wertsch and Minnick specify that rationality in school is concerned with the use and privileging of *text-based realities*, by which problem spaces are created, maintained, and acted upon through semiotic means. In the case of the logical syllogism, language creates a world apart, one whose boundaries must be known and respected to participate in classroom talk. For example, given that "All the bears in the Far North are white" and further that "Novaya Zemlya is a city in the Far North," we are expected to accept and apply these bounded aspects of the syllogistic world in an accepted fashion. The implicit purpose is to demonstrate linguistic ability to manipulate abstract signs, demonstrated in action rationally: answering a question about the color of bears in Novaya Zemlya. The purpose is pointedly not to consider the nature of bears or our experience of bears, and any recourse to such consideration will almost certainly doom us to failure. Invoking experiential knowledge external to the syllogistic world—for example, if Ivan has been to Novaya Zemlya and has actually seen a brown or blue or red bear there—can affirm a syllogistically incorrect answer, thereby threatening the structure of a rationalist ideational space founded exclusively on logic. Clearly what is being discussed are words and how to manipulate them effectively, not meanings or experiences; in classroom-based discourse, experience of bears, therefore, cannot be permitted to inflect implicitly syllogistic discussion of bears.

Another characteristic of text-based realities is the decontextualization of linguistic elements. These elements may at any time be freely abstracted from communicative context and viewed in isolation as objects of analysis: "In this practice, language becomes an object of reflection while simultaneously continuing to be an instrument of communication" (Wertsch and Minnick 1990, p. 75). Wertsch and Minnick argue that the object of analysis within text-based realities can be either form or meaning. Language teachers and students frequently do abandon experiential meaning to analyze the formal properties of language within the text-based realities they create. Without additional signs demanding a context-based response, a student account of personal experience might reasonably elicit classroom talk about the conjugation of verbs. Precisely how the event took place might reasonably lead to a discussion of the *passé composé* versus *imparfait.*

In the wider context of formal schooling, one of the main foci of text-based realities is the abstract meaning of particular words, the analysis of sense relations among lexemes or vocabulary items, where "sense" is the denotative meaning of a word abstracted from communicative context. For example, the relationship between the words "ophthalmologist" and the definition of "eye doctor" is assumed to be one of tautology in ideational space: It must universally obtain, independent of when or how the terms are used in communicative action.

By contrast, everyday communication typically does not involve analysis of strictly formal aspects of language, nor does it treat sense relations. Daily communication instead focuses on communicating about other, ostensibly nonlinguistic topics. But to succeed in school is to learn how to construct decontextualized language in order to manipulate text-based realities. Students learn to respect the boundaries of these realities and to operate on their objects in order to derive the results desired by teachers or instructional materials:

> *. . . rational discourse in school can largely be explicated in terms of text-based realities. The problem space of a text-based reality is created, maintained, and manipulated through the semiotic means employed in discourse. Furthermore, a text-based reality is characterized by boundedness and decontextualization. This decontextualization,*

> *which may focus either on the form or on the meaning of an expression, involves making words and other signs into objects of reflection instead of means of communication (Wertsch and Minnick 1990, p. 78).*

A well-known early example of research on the rational discourse of schooling can be found in Luria's (1976) studies comparing the performance of literate and nonliterate subjects in Central Asia on a series of tasks involving text-based realities. Luria compared three groups of subjects: those who had no schooling, those who had achieved minimal literacy, and those who had several years of schooling. Luria was interested in documenting the cognitive changes brought about by modernization under the Soviet regime. One of the tasks involved categorizing a series of objects. For example, subjects were shown pictures of four objects and were asked to select the one that did not belong with the others. In the following transcript, with editorial annotations by the researcher underlined, he has shown the series *hammer-saw-log-hatchet* to a 60-year-old illiterate peasant from the village of Yardan:

SUBJECT: *They all fit here! The saw has to chop the log, the hammer has to hammer it, and the hatchet has to chop it. And if you want to chop the log up really good, you need the hammer. You can't take any of these things away. There isn't any you don't need!*

Replaces abstract classification with situational thinking.

RESEARCHER: *But in the first example I showed you that the mouse didn't fit in.*

SUBJECT: *The mouse didn't fit it! But here all the things are very much alike [ukhshaidi]. The saw saws the log, and the hatchet chops it; you just have to hit harder with the hammer.*

RESEARCHER: *But one fellow told me the log didn't belong here.*

SUBJECT: *Why'd he say that? If we say the log isn't like the other things and put it off to one side, we'd be making a mistake. All these things are needed for the log.*

Considers idea of utility more important than similarity.

RESEARCHER: *But that other fellow said that the saw, hammer, and hatchet are all alike in some way, while the log isn't.*

SUBJECT: *So what if they're not alike? They all work together and chop the log.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Here, everything works right, here everything's just fine.

RESEARCHER: *Look, you can use one word—tools—for these three but not for the log.*

SUBJECT: *What sense does it make to use one word for them if they're not going to work together?*

Rejects use of generalizing term.

RESEARCHER: *What word could you use for these things?*

SUBJECT: *The words people use: saw, hammer, hatchet. You can't use one word for them all!*

RESEARCHER: *Could you call them tools?*

SUBJECT: *Yes, you could, except the log isn't a tool. Still, the way we look at it, the log has to be here. Otherwise, what good are the others?*

Employs predominantly situational thinking again.

—Luria 1976, pp. 58–59

With few exceptions, Luria found that his illiterate subjects were unable—or, perhaps, unwilling—to define the situation according to text-based realities. That is, they interpreted the tasks with reference to the concrete realities of their life experience; they refused to respect the boundedness and decontextualization implied by academic tasks. Parallel research demonstrated that the experience of having participated in even a few weeks of formal classroom discourse generally made participants—children and adults alike—far more disposed to accept the ideational space of text-based realities.

Luria assumed that such "situational thinking" was inherently inferior to the discourse of rationalism characteristic of schooled literacy and associated with progress and modernization. The latter, abstract rationalist thinking, was assumed to be a more complex and mediated higher-mental process. In this belief, Luria demonstrated his commitment to a Marxist worldview of evolutionary progress, accompanied by changes in mental stances, that is no longer widely accepted: that the process of constructing a modern communist state was an inevitable step forward in the social and mental evolution of humankind. Contemporary interpreters of Luria's data are therefore quick to remind us that all languages, including the Uzbek and Russian languages used in Luria's study, have the semiotic potential to create bounded text-based realities.

Nor, of course, is situational discourse inherently simple. Studies of "situational thinking" in a variety of settings have also repeatedly demonstrated the complexity of the semiotic means involved (e.g., Lave and Wenger 1991; Rogoff 1990). Despite the manifest difficulties surrounding their unfortunate interpretation, however, Luria's data remain compelling in their elucidation of the practices of schooled learning in contrast with other modes of discourse: They highlight the peculiarities of rational discourse in schools.

In analyzing children's mastery of rational discourse, Wertsch and Minnick note that the structural features and characteristics of text-based realities are not usually made explicit. Nor do teachers typically explain how to perform within text-based realities in any direct way. They do not, for example, instruct children in the use of metalanguages to guide their performance in text-based realities. Rather, they continually reinterpret students' utterances by exemplary action, restating and resituating them within a scientific paradigm. Teachers also continually participate in creating and maintaining text-based realities with their students, guiding students to redefine experiential situations by representing them in forms appropriate to academic discourse.

The importance of text-based realities is *implicit* within the discourse of the classroom. Equally implicit are the rules for operating within them. As such, they contribute to the construction of a deeply significant background framework for action in school. This infrequently examined framework is, in turn, attached to a "naturalized ideology" (Fairclough 1995) of schooled literacy, one that arose along with the spread of rational discourse within "modern" institutionalized schools, beginning in the nineteenth century. Underlying this ideology is a complex of ideas about literacy that Collins (1996) terms "textualism," the central beliefs of which include belief in the fixity of text, the transparency of language, and the universality of shared, available meaning. The textualist conception is associated with the broader criteria of modern Utilitarian rationalism. It defines the features of literacy as individually owned, quantifiable skills, typically focusing on the formal features of language: "Technical conceptions of literacy define reading and writing as skills, as precise, decomposable, quantifiable things . . ." (Collins 1996, p. 205).

Text-Based Realities in the Foreign Language Classroom

Discourses on language-learning tasks are typically grounded in a combination of rationalist assumptions about the nature of learning and Utilitarian panoptic assumptions (Foucault 1977; Scollon and Scollon 1995) about the locus of control in the classroom. If learning consists of building internal representations of form within the minds of individual learners, it is legitimate to search for those tasks that will most efficiently advance that process. Thus, for example, researchers such as Pica (1987) have searched for tasks and participant configurations that foster the negotiation of meaning that is presumed to lead to acquisition of form. Pedagogical discourses in textbooks routinely propose sequences of tasks that assume a seamless progression from mechanical manipulation of forms to communicative use of those forms. Underlying both approaches is the assumption that authority and control in the classroom are fundamentally centralizable and that they reside in the teacher's authoritative discourse or in the assignment of the task. Tasks are believed to constitute blueprints for performance: By implication, once the best or most efficient tasks have been discovered, it will be possible to provide all teachers with discrete units of technical knowledge that will enhance the process of language learning.

As Coughlan and Duff (1994) have shown, however, the meaning and outcomes of simple tasks are quite complex. To understand them, it is necessary to separate the abstract rationalist behavioral blueprint from the activity of participants. Coughlan and Duff's study shows how any given learning task will be realized in a variety of ways, depending on how the participants define the task's meaning within a specific situation inseparable from its mediating social and historical context. Studies by Kumaradivelu (1991) and Willis (1996) conclude that learners' interpretation of tasks can differ significantly from teachers' perceptions of those same tasks. A number of additional studies further indicate that how learners interpret the meaning of tasks can be at significant variance with the behavioral blueprint implied by teachers' intentions. When introduced into a classroom informed by historical and social experience, the interpretation of tasks also varies greatly from that predicted by theoretical stances that exist within the ideational space of SLA. For example, in a classroom-based study of the negotiation of meaning, testing the relevance of SLA tasks in the classroom, Foster (1998) observed no overall effect for task type or grouping. Many students in groups did not speak at all, and many more produced no negotiated interaction. Foster, therefore, concludes that negotiation of meaning is not a strategy that classroom learners are predisposed to employ when they encounter gaps in their understanding.

Given such variation in the interpretation of tasks by learners, how then can research attain a reasoned evaluation of teaching practices? *Activity Theory* would suggest that we examine the situation *as defined by the learners, themselves,* this is, as it has been shaped by histories of participation in the sociocultural practices of schooled learning. Within the framework of Activity Theory proposed by Coughlan and Duff (1994), following Vygotsky, Luria, and especially Leont'ev, development is a dynamic, interpersonal, and goal-directed process. Learners approach tasks in ways that are shaped by motives formed during previous participation in sociohistorically generated cultural practices. The outcome of particular classroom activities depends less on the externally imposed parameters of tasks than on the situation definition of the participants, that is, the way they represent the relevant setting, objects, events, and action patterns (Ashton 1996).

Clearly, no approach can account for all of the variation in learners' perceptions of tasks. However, it is also true that one universally relevant context for situating this discussion is institutional learning in schools and that the features of rational discourse pervade that context. Setting aside consideration of personal experience of classroom teaching, it follows syllogistically that, insofar as language education is a particular case of general schooled literacy, text-based realities are pertinent to the analysis of foreign language classroom: Rather than asking whether students themselves or a given task itself focuses on form or meaning, we may ask to what extent the participants' definition of the situation and their actions are shaped by a history of involvement in the boundedness and decontextualization of text-based realities in school, a context that applies whenever students approach a language learning task.

To recall: text-based realities construct a bounded semiotic world within which language is decontexualized and treated as an object of reflection. We can therefore anticipate that text-based realities in the language classroom will manifest a predominant focus on the formal properties of the language, in combination with a textualist emphasis on quantifiable skills. It is not difficult to find examples of classroom discourse that demonstrate the crossover from the broader realm of schooled literacy into a pervasive use of text-based realities in the foreign language classroom. As the following examples illustrate, text-based realities are invoked in a variety of settings and participation configurations, including both teacher-fronted and learner-learner discourse.

The first example is borrowed from Leeman-Guthrie's (1984) analysis of intake and communication in introductory French classes. Here, the teacher introduces an exercise on the formation of questions by inversion:

Example 1

1. *Teacher: Bon, dans le livre, à la page trois cent quatre-vingt treize, n'est-ce pas, il y a beaucoup de choses au sujet de l'inversion, beaucoup d'examples aussi.*

[Good, in the book, on page 393, right, there are a lot of things about inversion, a lot of examples, too.]

2. *Faisons très rapidement exercice six, en bas de la page, pour pratiquer l'inversion.*

[Let's do exercise six quickly, at the bottom of the page, to practice inversion.]

3. *Par example, il y a deux personnes qui parlent, vous et votre camarade.*

[For example, there are two people talking, you and your friend.]

4. *Ton frère, a-t-il une voiture?*

[Does your brother have a car?]

5. *Ici, l'inversion avec le verbe "avoir."*

[Here, inversion with the verb "avoir."]

6. *Et puis on peut répondre, "Oui, il a une voiture," "Non, il n'a pas de voiture."*

[And then you can answer, "Yes, he has a car," "No, he doesn't have a car."]

7. *Okay?*

8. *Brian, posez la question à John ici.*

[Brian, ask John here that question.]

9. *Avec numéro un.*

[With number one.]

10. Student A: *Ta soeur, a-t-elle une voiture?*
[Does your sister have a car?]

11. Student B: *Oui, elle a, uh...*
[Yes, she has, uh . . .]

12. *Teacher: Une voiture?*
[A car?]

13. Student B: *Oui, elle a une voiture.*
[Yes, she has a car.]

14. *Teacher: Est-ce que vous avez une soeur, oui ou non?*
[Do you have a sister, yes or no?]

15. *Non, il n'a ...*
[No, he doesn't . . .]

16. *Mais il faut, il faut dire oui ou non, n'est-ce pas?*
[But you have to, you have to say yes or no, don't you?]

17. *Oui, elle a une voiture.*
[Yes, she has a car.]

18. *Donc, ta soeur, a-t-elle une voiture?*
[So your sister, does your sister have a car?]

19. *Oui ou non.*
[Yes or no.]

Leeman-Guthrie's analysis focuses on the difficulties students may experience in interpreting the teacher's utterances due to a "constant fragmentation of focus between linguistic rules, the mechanics of accomplishing the lesson, and the 'real world' of the things and people present in the classroom" (Leeman-Guthrie 1984, p. 42). However, she notes with interest that students do not seem "in the least confused by the constant shifts in topic," citing a number of minimal cues available in the classroom and the textbook that allow the students to participate. Typically, the interaction begins with an element of absurdity: Students are required to accept an untrue proposition (that Student B has a sister) in order to participate.

If we situate this interaction within the broader context of schooled learning, it becomes clear that there is nothing unusual about this teacher's construction of a text-based reality. If the students and the teacher fail to achieve intersubjectivity within a common (or at least overlapping) definition of the situation, this dilemma is brief and easily overcome—*once the* *students recognize and accept that the teacher is organizing the discourse as a bounded semiotic world involving decontextualization of linguistic elements.* Student B may, in fact, have entered the interaction without having recognized the boundaries of the text-based reality, but he is experienced in matters of schooling: He very quickly asserts that his nonexistent sister has a nonexistent car, thus demonstrating his understanding of and compliance with the teacher's implicit directive. Hence, as an example of Discourse 1, this interaction demonstrates the significance of text-based realities and illustrates the ongoing processes of socialization linked to and inherent in their use. These social and historical processes are continuous through learners' experience in school and across different kinds of classrooms.

A second example demonstrates how text-based realities come into play as learners in a small group perform a task intended to elicit everyday, or "situational," (Luria 1976) discourse. This example is taken from data gathered for a study of learner interactive practices in intermediate French language classes (Kinginger 1990). Three learners, Abby, Bess, and Caleb, are performing a task involving conversation cards. Abby and Bess are ostensibly to ask one another questions about their lives in French, questions inscribed in English on the cards. Caleb is holding a card with correct versions of all the questions in French. His task, as instructed, is to *assist* Abby and Bess in posing their questions.

Example 2

1. C: ta question.
[Your question.]

2. A: um où est-ce que tu... passe um... ta um... ta... tas enfance?
[Um where do you . . . Spend um . . . Your um . . . Your . . . Yours childhood?]

3. C: tu as compris?
[Did you understand?]

4. A: ton enfance?
[Your childhood?]

5. B: oh. oui. je... je... je passais je... je passais mon enfance à Washington D.C.
[Oh. Yes. I . . . I . . . I used to spend I . . . I used to spend my childhood in Washington, D.C.]

6. C: quelle forme de verbe as-tu utilisée? pour la question.
[What form of the verb did you use? For the question?]

7. A: tu.
["tu."]

8. C: tu. où est-ce que...
["tu." where did . . .]

9. A: vous vous.
["vous. vous"]

10. C: all right où est-ce que tu...
[All right where did you . . .]

11. A: passe?
[spend ((present tense))]

12. C: c'est la c'est quelle forme? quelle forme de verbe passé.
[It's the it's which form? Which form of the verb "passé"?]

13. A: oh oh um.

14. C: c'est la forme... la question...
[its the form . . . the question . . .]

15. A: passe est est present mais passé et...
["passe" is is present but past and . . .]

16. C: et tu dis... comment dis-tu la question au passé composé?
[and you say . . . how do you say the question in the "passé composé"?]

17. A: oh ok c'est ça. où est-ce que. où est-ce que tu... um tu es? tu...
[oh ok that's it. where. where you . . . um you "es"? ((incorrect choice of auxiliary verb)) you . . .]

18. C: avec avoir.
[with "avoir" (correct auxiliary verb)]

19. A: um uh tu as. Où est-ce que tu as passé uh ton? enfance?
[um uh you. Where did you spend uh your? childhood?]

20. C: pas ton.
[not "ton."]

21. A: uh... ta?
[uh . . . "ta"?]

22. C: oh. that's um tu as raison! ton enfance!
[oh. that's um you are right! "ton enfance!"]

23. A: ah parce que... enfance...
[ah because . . . "enfance"]

24. C: oui.
[yes.]

25. A. commence... avec... um
[starts . . . with . . . um]

26. C: e.
[e.]

27. A: e.
[e.]

28. C: e. très bien! très bien.
[E. very good! very good!]

The stated goal of this interaction is achieved by Abby and Bess in the first five turns: Abby asks a question, and Bess answers it. Nonetheless, the stretch of discourse devoted to this question-and-answer cycle is actually twenty-eight turns long because, in turn 6, Caleb assumes the role of teacher. He seizes control of the discourse, reorients the interaction, and reinterprets the preceding turns as a text-based reality. Within that textualized idea space, several textual aspects are analyzed: the correct choice of address form, the conjugation of the verb, and the form of the possessive pronoun. It is interesting to note that as experienced students, Abby and Bess do not object in the slightest to the transformation of their utterances into objects of reflection and analysis. Nor do they seem confused or in any way at odds with this operation, despite the fact that it removes all experiential content from their discourse, appropriating its meaning from Discourse 2 to Discourse 1. Rather, they accept it and actively participate with Caleb as he challenges the formal properties of their talk and directs the refinement of the utterances toward the standard forms he holds on his card. Thus the learners continue to invoke text-based realities in their independent classroom work. In this example, the situational meaning of their dialogue leads them to subject their brief action to a far longer process of rational analysis, in itself a familiar characteristic of textualized academic discourse.

A final example is taken from a database of electronic mail messages exchanged between a class of third-year American learners of French and an advanced ESL class in France. The instructors had assigned all learners an e-mail partner in the companion class for an express purpose: They were to improve their communicative competence and cross-cultural understanding via a series of parallel tasks and texts organized around the topic of French/American intercultural communication (Kinginger, Gourvès-Hayward, and Simpson 1999). In practice, however, the students reinterpreted the exchange of e-mail as a medium for informal socializing. Clearly based on their experience of classroom talk and school learning, they reinterpreted the task to focus on the formal properties of the French language: A typical exchange of e-mail would involve writing about various aspects of everyday life and, in the case of several pairs of learners, correction and rewriting of the American learners' previous messages. The following example is taken from the correspondence of two learners whom we will call Victoria and Raoul. Victoria, the American learner, had sent the following message to Raoul:

Example 3

On Sun, 22 Feb 1998, Victoria wrote:

> Raoul,
>
> Salut! Ça va?
> Merci pour la lettre en allemand. Je ne suis pas aussi advancé que moi en allemand. Mais j'ai compris assez.
> Je vais écrire de ma vie quotidienne. Comme aujourd'hui. Je suis reveillé à 7h30. J'ai travaillé de 8h à 4h30. (Je travaille dans un hôpital. Je suis standartiste. Je travaille 20-30 heures chaque semaine.) Puis, je suis allée (avec mon mari) à l'épicirie pour acheter du détergent de lavevaisselle. Ensuite, Danny (mon mari) et moi sommes allés de la laboratoire d'ordinateur. Ce soir, nous allons manger le dîner et regarder des films. J'aime regarder des filmes. J'ai vu un peu de films français. Je doit partir maintenant.
>
> A bientôt!
>
> Victoria

> *Raoul,*
>
> *Hi! How are you?*
> *Thank you for the letter in German. I am not as advanced as me in German. But I understood enough.*
> *I am going to write about my everyday life. Like today. I woke up at 7:30. I worked from 8 to 4:30. (I work in a hospital. I am a phone operator. I work 20-30 hours each week.) Then, I went (with my husband) to the grocery store to buy dishwashing detergent. Then, Danny (my husband) and I went to the computer lab. Tonight, we are going to eat dinner and watch films. I like watching films. I have seen a few French films. I have to go now.*
>
> *See you later,*
>
> *Victoria*

On Monday, February 23, Raoul prefaced his response to this message (in English) by copying the original and adding corrections (given here in underlined italics):

> On Sun, 22 Feb 1998, Victoria wrote:
>
> Raoul,
>
> Salut! Ça va?
> Merci pour la lettre en allemand. Je ne suis pas aussi advancé que
> *avancée*
> moi en allemand. Mais j'ai compris assez.
> *toi* *j'en ai compris assez*
> Je vais écrire de ma vie quotidienne. Comme aujourd'hui. Je suis
> *parler (we can say "parler de" but not "écrire de")*
> reveillé à 7h30. J'ai travaillé de 8h à 4h30. (Je travaille dans un
> *réveillée (because you're a girl! But the rules about the verbs "se" something are complicated. Even I don't know them very good. I'll look them up for you.)*
> hôpital. Je suis une standartiste. Je travaille 20–30 heures chaque
> *Je suis standardiste. Je travaille de 20 à 30 heures*

> semaine.) Puis, je suis allée (avec mon mari) à l'épicirie pour
> *l'épicerie pour*
> achèter du détergent de lavevaisselle. Ensuite, Danny (mon mari)
> *acheter* *pour lave-vaisselle*
> et moi sommes allés de la laboratoire d'ordinateur. Ce soir, nous
> *au laboratoire d'informatique*
> allons manger le dîner et regarder des films. J'aime regarder des
> filmes. J'ai vu un peu de films français. Je doit partir maintenant.
> *J'ai vu quelques films français.*
>
> A bientôt!
>
> Victoria

In reading the rest of Raoul's response to Victoria in English, it is clear that he had little difficulty in comprehending the social and propositional meaning of her e-mail. In response, he offers commentary on French films along with details about his own "day in the life." However, in this example as elsewhere, a routine feature of e-mail exchange for learners is the transformation of personal messages into text-based realities. These objects are then subject to extensive formal analysis. Thus in his corrected/correcting version of Victoria's message, Raoul treats her writing as an object containing elements that can be extracted, analyzed, and commented on in turn. The positive disposition these learners held toward the activity of e-mail exchange, and the apparent positive regard they had for one another, suffered no ill effects from this routine, critical, and predictable scrutiny of message forms. This suggests that on both sides of the Atlantic, the presence of text-based realities is so ingrained a feature of language classroom discourse that it is perceived as normal, nonintrusive, and, in some ways essential.

Discussion

As noted, discourses on language learning are typically grounded in rationalist assumptions about the nature of learning. The distinction between "form" and "meaning," for example, has existed in various guises within the American foreign-language teaching literature of recent decades (and throughout the history of language teaching, according to Musumeci 1997), with divergent understandings of the learner's task giving rise to debate. A common thread in these discussions is that "form" and "meaning" are construed less as activities in social contexts than as metaphorically substantive acquirable things, and the debate has accordingly focused on the means of promoting individual learners' acquisition of those things.

In combination with a Utilitarian and panoptic view of the location of social control in classrooms, language-acquisition research generates implications for teaching, which, in recent years, have increasingly emphasized technical solutions to promote meaningful language use and diversify learners' participation in discourse. The solutions proposed include, for example, task-based syllabi, small group and pair work, and participation formats enabled by communication technologies such as e-mail and videoconferencing. All such propositions predict that changes in teaching techniques will engender changes in learners' activity.

One objective of this paper is to document a fact of which most teachers are already quite aware: that changes in participation format do not ensure that learners will change their interpretations of classroom activity. The data presented suggest that all forms of classroom participation, including teacher-led classroom discussion, small group and pair work, and international keypal arrangements, are susceptible to interpretation as text-based realities. To understand why this is so will require that researchers attend to the broader contexts of schooled learning, to learners' histories of participation in those contexts, and to the formation of motives grounded in sociocultural activity.

Such understanding may not lead to new technical solutions, but it does bring the dilemma of communicative teaching in schools into sharper focus. Specifically, it suggests that learners' understanding of classroom language is likely to include the assumption that the rational discourse of text-based realities is naturally superior and generally more useful than the "situational" discourse practices of everyday life. To challenge this assumption is to question the construct of abstract rationality as it is learned and practiced in schools.

If the goal of communicative language teaching is to promote situationally appropriate language use in a variety of everyday contexts, then it may be necessary to work at reshaping learners' interpretations of the language classroom. One way to proceed might be via systematic and explicit work on language awareness (van Lier 1995), to enhance learners' understanding of contextual variation in communication, and thereby to help them perceive the need to participate in a range of discourses, including both academic work and "everyday" situational activities. In order to facilitate the "disembedding of language learning from the prevailing discourse of lessons," a key issue for language pedagogy, according to Breen (1996, p. 101) among others, it may be helpful to enlist the informed support of learners directly.

Because text-based realities form a vital aspect of the "natural" discourse of schooling and of the wider society's definition of rational thought, however, it may not be reasonable to assume that institutional language education can or should always be disembedded from its social context. Therefore the argument presented here suggests a need for continued professional dialogue on the definition of "communicative competence" as that construct applies specifically to the context of schooled language and literacy. As defined by Savignon (1997), "communicative competence" is a "dynamic" and "context-specific" construct (pp. 14–15). Because communicative competence is context-specific, it stands to reason that the abilities developed in school will be characteristic of schooled learning to the extent that learners interpret their work as a special case of institutional education. School talk is highly significant to learners, whether it involves focus on form or the negotiation of sense relations (or focus on meaning). In addition to promoting change and variety in classroom discourses, the profession must account for and work with the opportunities and constraints of classroom language learning. Therefore the profession would benefit from a greater appreciation of classroom language use in its relation to the broader ideologies and practices of schooling as they are appropriated by learners and revealed in learners' activity.

Works Cited

Ashton, Patricia. 1996. The Concept of Activity. In *Vygotsky in the Classroom: Mediated Literacy Instruction and Assessment,* edited by Lisbeth Dixon-Kraus, 111–124. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Breen, Michael P. 1996. Constructions of the Learner in Second Language Research. In *Linguistics, Language Acquisition and Language Variation: Current Trends and Future Prospects,* edited by J. E. Alatis, C. A. Straehle, M. Ronkin, and B. Gallenberger, 84–107. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Cazden, Courtney. 1998. The Meanings of "Discourse." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Seattle, WA.

Collins, James. 1996. Socialization to Text: Structure and Contradiction in Schooled Literacy. In *Natural Histories of Discourse*, edited by Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 203–228. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Coughlan, Peter, and Patricia Duff. 1994. Same Task, Different Activities: Analysis of SLA Task from an Activity Theory Perspective. In *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*, edited by James P. Lantolf and Gabriela Appel, 173–193. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis.* New York: Longman.

Foster, Pauline. 1998. A Classroom Perspective on the Negotiation of Meaning. *Applied Linguistics* 19: 1–23.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Gee, James P. 1990. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses.* Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.

Harré, Rom, and Grant Gillett. 1994. *The Discursive Mind.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ionesco, Eugene. 1974. Exercices de conversation et de diction françaises pour étudiants américains. In *Théâtre V.* Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Kinginger, Celeste. 1990. Task Variation and Classroom Learner Discourse. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Kinginger, Celeste, Alison Gourvès-Hayward, and Vanessa Simpson. 1999. A Tele-Collaborative Course on French/American Intercultural Communication. *French Review* 75: 853–866.

Kumaradivelu, B. 1991. Language-Learning Tasks: Teacher Intention and Learner Interpretation. *English Language Teaching Journal* 45: 98–107.

Lantolf, James P., and Gabriele Appel, eds. 1994. *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lantolf, James P., and Aneta Pavlenko. 1995. Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 15: 108–124.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leeman-Guthrie, Elizabeth. 1984. Intake, Communication and Second Language Teaching. In *Initiatives in Communicative Language Teaching*, edited by Sandra J. Savignon and Margie S. Berns, 35–54. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Leont'ev, Alexander N. 1981. The Problem of Activity in Psychology. In *The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology*, edited by James V. Wertsch, 37–71. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Luria, Alexander. 1976. *Cognitive Development: Its Cultural and Social Foundations.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Musumeci, Diane. 1997. *Breaking Tradition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pica, Teresa. 1987. Second Language Acquisition, Social Interaction and the Classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 8: 3–21.

Rogoff, Barbara. 1990. *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Savignon, Sandra J. 1997. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice.* 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne Wong Scollon. 1995. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Scribner, S., and Michael Cole. 1981. *The Psychological Consequences of Literacy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stubbs, Michael. 1996. *Text and Corpus Analysis: Computer Assisted Studies of Language and Culture.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Tharp, Roland G., and Ronald Gallimore. 1988. *Rousing Minds to Life: Teaching, Learning and Schooling in Social Context.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

van Lier, Leo. 1995. *Introducing Language Awareness.* London: Penguin.

Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, James V. 1990. The Voice of Rationality. In *Vygotsky and Education: Instructional Implications and Applications of Sociohistorical Psychology*, edited by Luis Moll, 111–126. New York: Cambridge University Press.

______. 1998. *Mind As Action.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wertsch, J. V., and Norris Minnick. 1990. Negotiating Sense in the Zone of Proximal Development. In *Promoting Cognitive Growth over the Life Span,* edited by Milton Schwebel, Charles A. Maher, and Nancy S. Fagley, 71–87. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Willis, D. 1996. Accuracy, Fluency and Conformity. In *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching,* edited by J. Willis and D. Willis. Oxford, UK: Heinemann.

MEANING AND FORM IN CLASSROOM-BASED SLA RESEARCH: REFLECTIONS FROM A COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PERSPECTIVE[1]

Heidi Byrnes
Georgetown University

Introduction

Words that refer to the most central concerns in our lives often have a remarkable range of meanings since the issues they call up are ubiquitous and therefore allow for a multiplicity of human intentions and interests to be associated and enacted with them. *Water* as a way of quenching our thirst on a hot summer day is quite different from *water* in the context of ancient natural philosophy that postulated four basic elements, from *water* being subjected to a chemical analysis in a laboratory setting and being implicated in soil erosion or understood as a precondition for life as we know it on Earth.

So it is with the words *meaning* and *form* which, as this volume thematizes, allow for multiple perspectives within the field of foreign languages. In fact, for those most knowledgeable on the topic, the terms *form* and *meaning* can evoke associations that may override what is otherwise shared. Thus a cognitive psychologist interested in the phenomenon of language processing might say that learners have "to map the vocabulary (lexicon), grammar (syntax), and rules for building up sentence meanings (semantics) on their prior knowledge of the world" (Greene 1995, p. 89). Here *meaning* differs from its use by applied linguists in the term "negotiation of meaning" as a way of contrasting their notion of communicative competence with a universalist grammatical competence which, under the influence of Chomsky, had dominated much previous theorizing in linguistics. Finally, foreign language teachers might wonder what is so new about the centrality of meaning in the currently vibrant SLA research area Focus on Form (FonF). To them such an emphasis hardly seems novel when all along they have modeled the inseparability of meaning and form so that learners would acquire the second language not only fluently, accurately, and with sociopragmatic awareness, but also with literary sensitivity.

Language professionals, therefore, face a number of paradoxes. Our community is built around shared interests that manifest themselves in shared meanings in our discourses. But the resultant internal efficacy and efficiency of our communication can over time erode when the initial consensus gradually comes to be articulated in a number of highly specific interests. As a consequence, our communication practices must increasingly recognize the diverse audiences and interests in our midst aside from attending to outside constituencies. Internally, these are groups like the theoretician-linguist, the SLA researcher, the psychologist, the language teacher, the teacher-educator, and the program administrator; externally a lay public also has certain legitimate interests in our work. Finally, as Thomas (1998) convincingly points out for SLA theory construction, we must also be aware of our past, a formidable challenge in light of a kind of programmatic ahistoricity that asserts that SLA research has essentially appeared out of nowhere in the last generation.

To make an initial contribution to these efforts, this paper offers a critically interpretive reading of main directions in our most recent past, SLA research over roughly the last three decades, as these pertain to the relationship of meaning and form. I explicitly query the applicability of those research foci as well as their findings to college foreign language departments. Since for many readers the issues to be addressed lie within their own memory and experience, I hope to stimulate a reappraisal of both sets of practices, those in theorizing and research and those in teaching. I do so by suggesting that our ways of researching the developing meaning-form relationships in adult instructed language learning, of providing metaphors for college-level professionals to understand both their students' learning and their own classroom practices, and, finally, of recommending advantageous instructional interventions all are in need of being rethought within a framework that takes seriously *the* overriding characteristic of language learning, namely its long-term nature. For the instructed setting this translates into the need for comprehensive curricular planning.

I envision a number of benefits for our field. With a long-term curricular perspective, SLA researchers might be able to consider certain outstanding theoretical and empirical issues about adult-instructed foreign language learning that they cannot now frame, much less answer satisfactorily. Language teachers in turn might be able to make informed choices which, as Larsen-Freeman (1983) noted long ago, involves awareness, attitude, knowledge, and skills beyond those derived from narrowly linguistic assumptions, institutionalized through the dominance of methodologies and textbooks. Indeed, all faculty members in a foreign language department, irrespective of their instructional assignments, could begin to realize the benefits of a practice that Tedick and Walker (1994) characterize as "an understanding and internalization of complex sociocultural relationships as they are reflected in verbal and nonverbal discourse" in the classroom (p. 301). Finally, intellectual, institutional-structural, administrative, and pedagogic issues that now crowd in on collegiate foreign language departments might also be addressed in new ways. By engaging in what Freeman (1994) calls a "grounded examination . . . within the broader framework of teacher-learner, context, and process" (p. 195),[2] all members of a departmental faculty could, in a comprehensive and intellectually and ideologically less constricted fashion, attend to the specific nature of the setting in which their teaching and their students' learning takes place, an activity that constitutes the heart of developing appropriate curricula and appropriate pedagogies. That such an engagement might be the real essence of the calls for accountability that our external audiences have repeatedly raised with us—an interpretation that contrasts with the frequent analysis of a corporate takeover of the soul of the academy—only adds to the urgency and soundness of the project.

Some explanatory comments are in order. First, by concentrating on SLA research foci pertaining to meaning-form connections, as contrasted with pedagogical practices, I do not endorse the pecking order that teaching is the passive recipient of research results and itself has little effect on the research agenda nor on proposed solutions. To the contrary, by recommending a curricular frame of reference, I question the continued tacit assumption that even classroom-based SLA research can establish and assert its scholarly status, validity, and value largely independent of language teaching and learning contexts.

Second, my characterization of the collegiate teaching and learning environment might appear unnecessarily restrictive. I rely primarily on

North American research, not because I am unaware of excellent work elsewhere, but because I believe that the insights about language learning that a number of groups within the SLA community now urgently need arise from a better understanding of how educational and instructional contexts themselves, with their contingencies and dependencies, deeply affect the very nature and quality of language learning (van Lier 1988).

Finally, I feature curricular and instructional practices associated with foreign language programs that maintain a graduate component. I do so because those SLA researchers who focus on foreign language learning (as contrasted with ESL) generally reside in graduate foreign language departments or, at least, use their undergraduate courses, largely taught by graduate TAs, as their research sites. Also, future academics, irrespective of their specialization in literary, linguistic, or cultural studies, are socialized into the profession within graduate programs. In other words, for better or for worse, graduate programs assume a particularly prominent role in our understanding of foreign language learning and teaching.

Foreign language supervisors and coordinators are the crucial audience for what I want to argue. Although they themselves are often vulnerable members of graduate departments, they are key actors working toward their change. As SLA researchers they also contribute to that community. Finally, given their varied backgrounds—from applied linguistics, to FL education, to literary or cultural studies—they may also be a critical audience in the other sense of the word. Inasmuch as they do not share my assumptions, experiences, and interpretive assessments, they may also question my two-pronged recommendations—namely, to create comprehensive collegiate curricula in order to make possible an expanded classroom-based SLA research effort and, on its basis, to enhance college foreign language teaching and learning. It is a challenge I hope that all parties can meet in the interest of enhancing the adult learners' ability to learn foreign languages, the real goal of my paper.

Situating Meaning and Form in SLA Research

Recent SLA research has approached language learning through a relatively small number of concepts that reside along the comprehension-production axis for explicating the acquisition of meaning-form relationships—input, interaction, negotiation, intake, and output. In contrast with an earlier emphasis on formal aspects of language as provided by structural linguistics, the '70s saw the development of theoretical constructs and methodologies in SLA research that focused on meaning through the notion of comprehension. As a consequence, studies increasingly used psychological concepts for new insights, most notably developmental psychology with its inherent interest in child language acquisition and educational psychology with its concern for the success of children in educational contexts, particularly immigrant and minority children.

One can readily understand such an emphasis on comprehension. After all, for a language to be learned, it must first come to the learner's attention, a step research operationalized in terms of language becoming comprehensible. So central was this notion for theorizing and research on acquiring a language that it was dubbed "natural" even within instructional settings that patently lack key ingredients of the "natural" environment of child first-language learning (Krashen and Terrell 1983). In other words, for both kinds of language learning it was claimed that the learners' focus on meaning, that is, comprehension, was essential, since it simultaneously enabled them also to acquire the formal features of a language.

Three developments subsequently challenged Krashen's so-called Input Hypothesis (1982; 1985). First, the theoretical claim that comprehensible input is not merely a necessary but also a sufficient environment for second-language learning early on invited strong counterarguments (Gregg 1985). For one, it made instruction irrelevant at best, counterproductive at worst. From the standpoint of psychology, too, Krashen's separating "language learning," the conscious attending to form through instruction, from "language acquisition," the essentially unconscious internalization of the system of a second language, seemed both needlessly dichotomous and counterintuitive. Finally, gradually accumulating experience with older second- and foreign-language learners, particularly in college foreign language programs that espoused a communicative or proficiency orientation that often incorporated some of the comprehension-based tenets of the Natural Approach, raised serious doubts in foreign language departments. Some professionals questioned the gains when programs perhaps no longer produced communicatively and sociopragmatically limited learners with halting, though reasonably correct, language but, instead, graduated fluent, but woefully inaccurate, even fossilized, learners with seemingly little hope of further progressing in their acquisition (Byrnes 1992; Hammerly 1991; Valette 1991).

But the concern transcended the well-known institutional and pedagogical limitations of foreign language instruction in the United States. Canadian immersion learners, who presumably enjoyed the benefits of the desired focus on meaning and long-term instructional sequences, turned out to be unable to control the more formal features of language and fell short of targetlike language ability with regard to other important aspects of language performance (Harley and Swain 1984; Swain and Lapkin 1989). In response, SLA research, over a period of years, reconsidered its central understandings about the nature and role of comprehension in language learning and concluded that "comprehensible output is a necessary mechanism of acquisition independent of the role of comprehensible input" (Swain 1985). At minimum, it was suggested, a focus on output, not only comprehensible input, was critical for encouraging learners to move from purely semantic analysis and processing to a syntactic analysis.

In order to begin to operationalize this line of thinking, new research methodologies began to explore the following notions: learners noticing the gap between their own and targetlike performance; learners engaging in hypothesis testing through modifying certain parts of their speech in order to determine more closely how the language works; and learners consciously reflecting, through the forms used in their output, on the essence of their hypotheses about the language. As Swain (1995) states: "Learners negotiate meaning, but the content of that negotiation is language form, and its relation to the meaning they are trying to express; they produce language and then reflect upon it. They use language to 'negotiate about form'" (p. 133).

In this fashion, it was hoped, research would be able to address two problems of instructed language acquisition: the need to expand students' opportunities for a range of registers in language use and the premature stabilization of interlanguage systems and its consequences for less than acceptable levels of accuracy. In other words, SLA research had taken an important step toward understanding characteristics of instructed language learning that were not captured by the previous emphasis on comprehended meanings. Reconsidering an input focus with a near prohibition of instructional interventions, studies now not only investigated the role of input and output but explored a range of pedagogical interventions, from implicit to explicit, in order to focus the learners' attention on formal aspects of language while maintaining the centrality of meaning.

Indeed, such a more balanced development of meaning and form relationships in the interlanguage of instructed learners is the prominent concern of ongoing research reported in the *focus on form* literature.[3] The aim is to connect the benefits of communicative language teaching which primarily lie in interactional fluency with the advantages of attention to linguistic form, thereby assuring long-term interlanguage restructuring that can lead learners to target-language-like levels of performance. Long (1991) states the stance taken by researchers and practitioners with a FonF orientation in the following fashion:

> *Whereas the content of lessons with a focus on* forms *is the* forms *themselves, a syllabus with a focus on* form *teaches something else—biology, mathematics, workshop practice, automobile repair, the geography of a country where the foreign language is spoken, the cultures of its speakers, and so on—and overtly draw [sic] students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication (pp. 45–46).*

In clarifying how a focus on form is to deliver the benefits of a communicative approach while attending to language code, Doughty and Williams observe that

> *during an otherwise meaning-focused classroom lesson, focus on form often consists of an occasional shift of attention to linguistic code features—by the teacher and/or one or more students—triggered by perceived problems with comprehension or production (1998b, p. 23).*

In other words, form and meaning are no longer juxtaposed to each other in polar opposition.

> *Rather, focus on form* entails *a focus on formal elements of language, whereas focus on formS is* limited *to such a focus, and focus on meaning* excludes *it. Most important, it should be kept in mind that the fundamental assumption of focus-on-form instruction is that meaning and use must already be evident to the learner at the time that attention is drawn to the linguistic apparatus needed to get the meaning across (Doughty and Williams 1998b, p. 4).*

Fundamentally this is a learner-centered approach, one that "is always triggered by an analysis of learner need rather than being imposed externally by a linguistic syllabus" (Doughty and Williams 1998b, p. 5) and one that attempts to guide learners' attentional resource allocation in ways that are most conducive to developing both fluency and accuracy. From a more theoretical perspective, Doughty also characterizes it as subscribing to an interlanguage model (see Selinker 1972) that

> *proposes that learners mentally formulate and test hypotheses about what is and what is not possible in the target language and test those hypotheses through interaction with speakers of the target language. . . . Learners are thought to be equipped with significant psycholinguistic mechanisms that assist in the language-construction and hypothesis-testing processes of SLA (1998, p. 141).*

Consequently, carefully channeling learners through various strategies for attending to, comparing, and mapping meaning-form relationships, noticing differences and frequencies; and storing chunked language complexes in memory are central features within the six major pedagogical choices that are integral to the FonF movement:

- whether to focus on form;
- reactive versus proactive focus on form;
- choice of linguistic form;
- explicitness of focus on form;
- sequential versus integrated focus on form; and
- the role of focus on form in the curriculum

(Doughty and Williams 1998c).

Answers to these questions are sought through research that varies along the dimensions of (1) the continuum from explicit to implicit learning with its careful delineation of the notions of attention, awareness, noticing, and consciousness (e.g., Fotos 1993; Robinson 1994, 1995a; Schmidt 1995a, 1995b; Tomlin and Villa 1994); (2) the importance of both positive and negative evidence in the learning environment to make learners aware of otherwise unnoticeable features to assure continued restructuring or potentially to speed up the acquisitional process; (3) various techniques for input enhancement (Sharwood Smith 1993); (4) different approaches to feedback, including error correction (Tomasello and Herron 1988; Lightbown and Spada 1990); and (5) fixed acquisitional sequences (Pienemann 1985, 1989; Pienemann and Johnston 1986) with their impact on a number of the aforementioned questions, particularly timing and the choice of forms that are to be the focus of instruction.

In investigating these topics, an increasing number of FonF studies have concluded that the robustness of their findings depends on four critical aspects: (1) Studies need to consider with much greater care the subjects' learning environments; (2) repeat studies with an ethnographically similar learner group that would corroborate earlier findings are critical; (3) longitudinal investigation is no longer nice but dispensable, but central for making valid claims; (4) such longitudinal studies should be located within a curricular context.

Of course, classroom-based research has always included a minimal ethnographic perspective so as to assure the validity of the researcher's analytic categories and also the appropriateness of applications in the varied contexts of language classrooms (e.g., Chaudron 1988, p. 24). However, demands for a critical examination of the available resources and constraints of a particular learning environment are now made more explicit in order to develop a theory of situated practice that starts by recognizing the impact of various local contingencies (Bailey and Nunan 1996; van Lier 1988, 1996). Taking a long-term developmental view likewise is not new. Prominent focus-on-form researchers like Long have consistently called for that perspective, and most recently Doughty and Williams (1998c) have reiterated the importance of curricular contexts in their decision-making grid for FonF treatments. However, in the absence of extended foreign language curricula, research has continued to focus on detailing the psychological mechanisms of the individual learner, not on investigating situated and developing performance capabilities. Thus we have highly refined treatments of the nature of input and output processing, particularly such central notions as noticing, attention, awareness, and consciousness in assuring continued interlanguage development (see particularly Bialystok 1994; Ellis and Beaton 1995; MacWhinney 1987; Robinson 1995a; Robinson et al. 1995; Schmidt 1995a, 1995b; Segalowitz 1995; Segalowitz et al. 1995; Sharwood Smith 1993; Skehan 1998; Tomlin and Villa 1994; VanPatten 1994, 1996, 1998). What remains to be considered in depth, however, are stages of learning within a particular learning environment, specifically long-term development within a curricular framework.

A similar need for a curricular context, I believe, is now also surfacing in two other long-standing lines of SLA research that deserve mention: those exploring interaction and negotiation as facilitating comprehension and, more recently, language development (Mackey in press), and those focusing on input processing. Interaction-focused research (e.g., Gass

1997; Gass and Mackey 1998) builds on the realization that much in the learners' language environment is actually incomprehensible rather than comprehensible input. However, it can be made more comprehensible through various forms of linguistic adjustments in interaction between native speakers and nonnative speakers alike. An expanded line of thinking concentrates on how interaction itself, between the participants in communication, affects the pragmatic dynamic between them through such communicative moves as confirmation checks, clarification requests, agreement with someone, or expansion on someone's turn (e.g., Pica 1992, 1994; Pica, Young, and Doughty 1987). Current work thus explores a direct connection between interactional modifications and learning outcomes, rather than via comprehension (Mackey in press).

Recognizing that interaction likely increases the amount of language exchanged but does not necessarily involve participants equally, researchers have elaborated the notion of task. It is worth observing that *task* is not the same as a communicative group or partner activity that has a *real-world* flavor. Instead, as used in the research literature and as a pedagogical and curricular concept, the notion of "task" refers to refined specification of the cognitive demands that attend to various aspects of language use, particularly in negotiated interaction (e.g., Coughlan and Duff 1994; Crookes 1986; Crookes and Gass 1993a, 1993b; Duff 1993; Foley 1991; Fotos and Ellis 1993; Gass and Varonis 1985; Kumaravadivelu 1993; Long 1989; Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1993; Nunan 1989; Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun 1993; Plough and Gass 1993; Robinson, Ting, and Erwin 1995; Yule, Powers, and Macdonald 1992). Initially, the most prominent task environments explored the effects of convergent as contrasted with divergent tasks (Duff 1993; Robinson 1995b), information gap tasks, jigsaw, problem solving, decision making, and opinion exchange (Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun 1993). More recently, task as a viable research construct—task complexity; in terms of cognitive task demands; task difficulty, in terms of learner factors such as aptitude or motivation; and task conditions, in terms of the interactive demands of a task—has begun to be extended to other genres and forms of language use (e.g., narrativity). That has shown that, ultimately, the researchability, satisfactory resolution of seeming inconsistencies in findings, and usefulness for pedagogical interventions require a curricular context (Robinson in press).

The second direction, input processing research, directly concerns itself with the nature of learner language processing. Accordingly, VanPatten

(1990, 1994, 1996, 1998) and VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) have highlighted noticing, awareness, and consciousness, as contrasted with the more standard emphasis in much language teaching on output processing and production, practice, and control. They found that, through processing instruction, their collegiate learners of Spanish gained both in comprehension and production (VanPatten and Cadierno 1993). But here, too, a curricular context would significantly bolster research results.[4]

In other words, a number of key research approaches in instructed SLA now require curricular contexts. In light of the history of foreign language education in the United States, it is difficult to be optimistic that foreign language departments will respond to this challenge. However, that is all the more reason for taking the first steps toward making it a professional priority.

Assumptions in SLA Research and the Construction of College Foreign Language Instruction

My overview thus far has indicated that choices in SLA research foci and conceptual and methodological approaches often reveal remarkably specific interests. That is, of course, to be expected. Nor would it be cause for concern, were it not for a strong tendency to generalize from these interests and the research findings they generate to other learning contexts, to privilege certain agendas and approaches, and to derive from them major theoretical positions or even undergird them with powerful *a priori* theoretical positions. More often than not collegiate foreign language learning plays a marginal role in this interplay. Indeed, one could say that its instructional approaches reflect a kind of "receivership," with others' findings not only accepted generously but naturalized to an amazing degree. Our first task, therefore, is to deconstruct those "natural orders," by examining characteristics that inhere in the sites favored by SLA research for their applicability to college foreign language learning. I single out three broad areas: the language learning task itself, the instructional context with its implications for a focus on meaning/content or form, and the learners' presumed cognitive/content needs along with their linguistic needs and goals.

An obvious mismatch between the assumptions underlying foreign language learning and the majority of studies in second-language acquisition pertains to the difference between second language learning, particularly ESL, and foreign-language learning. SLA researchers and practitioners have long been aware of this distinction. Yet, although foreign-language oriented studies have recently increased, the field as a whole continues to derive many of its theoretical constructs, empirical foci, and research methodologies from ESL contexts, either ESL in K–12, that is, mostly in the lower grades, or ESL studies pertaining to advanced learners in university settings.

Second, immersion language learning, particularly the near-unique Canadian situation, has been the site for SLA studies that have justly received much attention. But that instructional context is remarkably at odds with college foreign-language learning in the United States—a difference that would not much matter were it not for the significant impact that research findings derived from it have had on the conceptualization that the entire research community has developed, as well as for instructed foreign language learning. For, what is called foreign-language learning in the United States really does not focus on meaning or content as presupposed in the Canadian setting and in the FonF research agenda that, in important ways, builds on it (see the earlier quotes). Even communicative approaches in U.S. foreign-language teaching, by and large, continue to operate with an *a priori* underlying linguistic progression, the very aspect that is being challenged by this research, when it assumes a "prerequisite engagement in meaning before attention to linguistic features can be expected to be effective" (Doughty and Williams 1998b, p. 3). In other words, to this line of thinking, it is only on the basis of a well-established prior focus on meaning that the complex task of acquiring meaning-form relationships can be appropriately addressed. Only then is it possible to recommend the "what" and the "how" of a focus on form which, as the articles in the Doughty and Williams volume indicate, actually permit a broad range of types of interventions. Some of them (e.g., DeKeyser 1998) may even appear to be deceptively reminiscent of the old grammar instruction. But they differ importantly from those earlier formS-focused practices, due to their embeddedness within a content focus, because they build on previously established learner needs and because they recognize and creatively exploit different kinds of processing demands in language performance.

However, matters are even more complex. Where a foreign language program does focus on content, typically during the third and fourth years of undergraduate instruction, instructors and learners alike struggle with the most peculiar ambiguities. Programmatically learners are presumed to be in command of the language; therefore they receive little instructional support for increasing their facility in the literate behaviors of language use, namely the discourse-level and genre-specific meaning-form relationships that characterize advanced language performance in all modalities. However, given the previous assumptions about meaning and form relationships that instructors and learners alike enacted in a formS-focused approach, a seemingly open-ended content focus, ironically, is neither appropriate nor possible at this stage since learners' interlanguage reflects a considerable need to attend to a host of complex meaning-form relationships in their language use—in terms of accuracy, fluency, complexity, and range. James (1989) eloquently described this dilemma over ten years ago; little seems to have changed.

In other words, neither the language teaching component of the typical undergraduate curriculum, which is focused on formS, nor the content focus of third- and fourth-year courses fulfills the conditions that characterize immersion instruction. Similarly, neither component meets the conditions for pedagogic interventions to enhance meaning-form acquisition as the FonF research agenda has proposed them.

Let me illustrate this point with an example. Learners of French must acquire the formal as well as the semantic properties of the imparfait and the passé composé (Salaberry 1998), a "local level" formal capability relating to tense and aspect. In current practice, the formal features associated with that distinction are typically introduced during second-semester French and thereafter much reiterated as formal phenomena due to persistent difficulties with accuracy. However, the real reason why learners need to command the multiple meaning-form relationships that instantiate tense and aspect phenomena is to be able to develop a finely honed narrative capability that is evoked by and enters into a host of communicative contexts, from face to face discourse to a range of formal environments of extended public speaking and writing.

Much research acknowledges that to be a long-term development that is central, if not definitional, to a number of genres (Dechert 1983; Salaberry 1998; Snow 1989; and the following discussion). By all accounts it is also a development that is fostered not by first attending to formal accuracy and then applying these accurate forms to various contexts, but *in the performing of these communicative tasks in a well-motivated sequence that recognizes various processing demands as it links meaning and form.* I believe it is fair to say that such an approach is not enacted in foreign language departments because it is not really enactable in their existing curricular environments. As a result everyone loses. Teachers and learners are severely shortchanged. And researchers, too, are unable to accomplish their complex goals, such as understanding just how learners develop a kind of narrative ability that is marked by genre-specific, pragmatic, discoursal, sociolinguistic, institutional-ethnographic, and cultural aspects of language use (Robinson 1995b; Schiffrin 1987).

My last observation regarding the mismatch between the interests of SLA research and those arising within collegiate foreign-language learning refers to why students take language classes in the first place. Although all classrooms combine learners with differing attitudes, motivations, and learning goals, college language instruction, by virtue of its institutional setting, faces particular challenges. Sitting side by side are learners whose only "need" and intention are to fulfill the foreign language requirement and who terminate their involvement with language study at the earliest possible opportunity; learners who, often quite unexpectedly, actually develop some interest and vaguely perceived needs as they engage in learning the language; and learners who had explicit goals right from the start that required a long-term trajectory, for instance, the anticipation of using the language competently in a professional or academic context once they graduate. Therefore although the bulk of language instruction addresses the first group, it must be conceptualized and conducted in a fashion that includes the possibility for the second group to develop its interests, while supporting with appropriate pedagogical interventions the aspirations of the third to attain advanced levels of language performance. Despite much concern about fossilization or unbalanced language acquisition, I find little in research that directly addresses this pivotal issue.

Reflections on the Collegiate Language Learner and SLA Research

After having explored the disjunctures vis-à-vis college-level foreign-language learning that arise from the interests that dominate SLA research, we are ready to look, in some depth, at what I consider to be the most far-reaching concern, namely an insufficiently articulated acknowledgment that collegiate language learners have characteristics that must be taken seriously if they—and we—are to be able to act responsibly and successfully.

Specifically, college language learners in the United States, more often than not, are being researched in terms of being rank beginners or perhaps intermediate-level learners of a language. Such a conceptualization has privileged a focus on the acquisition of the formal inventory of the language, primarily in terms of morphological and syntactic accuracy and range of use in spoken language, at times also on the developing ability to read and write L2 texts. The result is a curious admixture of various, often contradictory, tenets, among them some derived from child language acquisition, some from naturalistic learning by adults in the L2 setting, some from habit formation, some from the nature of a generalizable rule-based calculus, some from interactional dynamics, and some from neurologically fixed sequences.

Arguably, adult instructed language learning combines all these features, but their relevance and usefulness can be ascertained and adjudicated only in relation to the fact that these are literate adults who therefore differ from the assumptions just mentioned in terms of who and what they already are, and who and what they aspire to be. Unless we recognize and research those differences, we continue to run the risk of overextending, underextending, or otherwise missing the mark regarding the best practices in adult teaching and learning.

I suggest two approaches: identify aspects in the setting, in relation to these learners, that are so definitional that classroom-based SLA research, to be relevant and maximally beneficial to collegiate learning, must take note of them; and return to existing SLA research for possible findings that specifically address characteristics of the collegiate-instructed learner and could therefore enhance instructional practice.

The Setting of College Language Learning

A key interest of college-level faculty in language departments is to assert and maintain the intellectual aspirations and goals that define them as college-level academic units. Although variations surely exist, the faculty in graduate departments who have the power to make such judgments, namely, the literature professoriate frequently conclude that much in contemporary language learning and teaching does not respond to that requirement. Most distressingly, the communicative turn is being interpreted as detrimental to these aspirations (see Byrnes 1998a) that are made visible by and are anchored in the familiar structural-administrative arrangements for language departments. Thus while many factors contribute to the creation of language centers separate from language departments, their increasing use as a unit that attends to language learning and teaching at the very least signals that outsourcing that specific component has relatively few costs for the academic self-identification of language departments. Put slightly differently, engaging with language by emphasizing interactive, contextualized, everyday spoken language without a particular content focus, as much communicative language teaching does, contributes so marginally to the academic presence and self-identity of a department that its being spun off into a separate unit is not a debilitating, much less destructive, development that faculty should vigorously oppose. As I will explicate, I consider this position both understandable under current conditions—and extraordinarily shortsighted, counterproductive, and perhaps even negligent of professional responsibilities.

How could a changed SLA research agenda contribute to a reversal of this state of affairs? I believe a beneficial approach would be to recover from the construct of communication aspects that pertain to the variable, complex meaning-form relationships that mark, at times define, different genres and discourses (e.g., Biber 1986), and various kinds of literacies and literatures and are at the heart of inquiry and interpretation, creativity, and critical engagement in L1 and in L2—as contrasted with "mere" conversational interactions (Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes 1991). First and foremost, such a research orientation would seriously consider that college-level learners are literate adults who are pursuing an education with the intention of becoming effective participants in the world of work. That world makes high demands of them, regarding their working lives, their public lives as citizens, and their private lives in their respective life worlds (New London Group 1996). Education is now striving to contribute to their success in each of these environments through a kind of literacy pedagogy that addresses the different subjectivities they possess in different contexts—inherently a matter of attendant languages, discourses, registers, and their use as resources in learning (p. 72). Educational policy makers refer to these matters as the need to improve learners' ability to read and think critically, to write coherently, and to speak in public settings in ways that respect the emerging pluralistic forms of citizenship. Foreign language specialists would do well to join that reflection.

Fortunately in my estimation, SLA researchers and foreign language professionals are uniquely capable of linking up with this agenda of multiliteracies, a claim I hope to substantiate in the final section of this paper.

Not only would they assure greater depth and broader ranges of insights for their work and that of language departments, they would also be able to become a valuable presence in discussions about the goals of education now pervading higher education from the most general policy level to the creation of mission and goals statements in individual colleges and universities and departments.

A third characteristic of the context of college language learning and teaching that is much in need of rich, well-documented SLA research pertains to the severe time constraints imposed on both learners and teachers which, mercifully perhaps, we have learned to accept uncritically. But there is another way to look at time constraints, namely in terms of efficiency and efficacy of L2 learning under such conditions. The much cited evidence for hours of study that learners in the government language schools require in order to reach a certain level of proficiency or comparison studies of the *outcomes* of college foreign-language learning in terms of various proficiency measures get it only half right. Instead, we need longitudinal studies for both *efficiency of learning* and *effectiveness of teaching* that recognize the college foreign-language learning context with great honesty for what it is and for what it never was nor ever will be. Contrary to some fears, that is not the same as lowering the bar of expected outcomes. In fact, to be taken seriously, such a research agenda must envision, at least in principle, that learners can be more appropriately supported in their quest for learning languages to upper levels of performance than has customarily been the case.

Alternative Views of the Collegiate Foreign-Language Learner

Thus far I have highlighted what I consider to be dominant thinking in SLA research for explicating the learners' evolving capacity to develop a rich repertoire of appropriate meaning-form relationships. Although I have concluded that many of those findings have only limited relevance for college foreign-language learning and teaching, more recent studies with a cognitive frame of reference that show a much higher promise of addressing the adult-instructed learner have emerged.

Among these is a reconsideration of the well-known fact that humans learn a second language more effectively and completely before they become adults—often summarized under the so-called critical-period hypothesis and taken to account for much incomplete language acquisition, even in the restricted context of college instruction. However, instead of interpreting that fact negatively as a biologically grounded deficit that results in insuperable limitations, one can also look at these social and psychological characteristics of adult learners in terms of possibilities and limitations that can be creatively incorporated into our awareness of what language learning might look like. Thus Skehan (1998) formulates the following central assumptions:

> *It is that* meaning *takes priority for older learners, and that the* form *of language has secondary importance. This claim relates to both comprehension and production. Regarding comprehension, the resources to extract meaning that humans possess increase in effectiveness as we get older. . . . Moving to production as language users, we develop effective means of coping with one of the greatest problems of all: how to keep speaking at normal rates in real time. We do this in a number of ways. . . . Rather than construct each utterance 'mint fresh,' . . . we economize by stitching together language chunks which free processing resources during communication so that planning for the form and content of future utterances can proceed more smoothly (1998, p. 3).*

Most notably, that statement connects the insights of a cognitivist approach with long-standing considerations in the literature that have proposed a dual-mode processing, one that relies on analysis and rule application and the other that is based on nonanalyzed exemplars, various collocations and memory based language chunks (Bolinger 1961; Carr and Curran 1994; Pawley and Syder 1983; Skehan 1998; Widdowson 1989). The two systems exist side by side, with each having clear advantages and disadvantages under different communicative demands. For example, while the syntactically oriented, rule-based system affords generativity through its rules, thereby enhancing complexity and accuracy of language use, exemplar-based processing contributes fluency to language performance.

What makes these two simultaneous processing systems so powerful for all language users is that users can access one or the other under different task conditions and task demands and achieve quite different performance profiles. Furthermore, there are processes that allow entire utterances or chunks of utterances, once they have been analytically created, to be stored in memory, thereby significantly expanding the potential for fluent memory-based processing of major syntactic units. In turn, a predisposition toward a rule-based perspective, particularly in conjunction with a variety of metacognitive processes, is likely to lead to longer-term change in learners' interlanguage, either by making it larger or by making it more complex. Both shifts, in their own way, amount to a restructuring of the learner's interlanguage grammar.

The possibilities for applying these insights to instructed second language development are striking, particularly when we connect them to the task-based research mentioned earlier. We can then lay the foundation for a well-founded pedagogy that first takes the adult learner seriously and, second, builds into our decision-making process the possibility of long-term learning, potentially to advanced levels of performance (Crookes 1986; Crookes and Gass 1993a, 1993b; Long 1994; Long and Crookes 1993; Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1993; Norris, Brown, Hudson, and Yoshioka 1998; Robinson 1995b; Robinson, Ting, and Erwin 1995; Skehan 1998).

For example, Skehan (1998, p. 129) lists five principles for linking task-based instruction with the claims for a dual-processing capacity: Choose a range of target structures; choose tasks that meet the utility criterion that recognizes some forms have a particularly high usefulness for expressing certain meanings; select and sequence tasks to achieve balanced language development between accuracy, fluency, and complexity; maximize the chances of focus on form through attentional manipulation; and use cycles of accountability that reflect on what was accomplished with certain pedagogical tasks.

The three earlier mentioned aspects of tasks—complexity, difficulty, and conditions of performance—need particularly careful consideration: (1) The notion of inherent task complexity and the identification of factors addresses what are essentially cognitive burdens (e.g., familiar versus unfamiliar; here and now versus remote; concrete versus abstract; simple retrieval versus transformation); (2) the notion of task difficulty refers to individual learner factors, such as aptitude, confidence, motivation, and proficiency level; (3) task conditions affect the perceived difficulty during the performance of a task (e.g., time pressure, modality, language use, support, surprise, control, and stakes). As Robinson (in press) argues, task complexity "should be the sole basis of prospective sequencing decisions since most learner factors implicated in decisions about task difficulty can only be diagnosed in situ and in process." By extension, aspects of task difficulty and task performance would form the basis for pedagogical decision making in a particular classroom setting with its specific goals, specific learners, and specific considerations of the instructional sequence. For instance, is the intention that learners reach toward new language capabilities, or are they to shore up fragile existing ones by carefully refocusing their attention to fluency, accuracy, or complexity of language? In the end, as Skehan (1998) notes:

> *This perspective implies that in addition to having principles for the selection and implementation of individual tasks, sequences of tasks should also be examined for the cumulative impact that they will have. In this way, knowledge about task properties and implementation alternatives can ensure that the flow of tasks and their use is not going to make it more likely that unbalanced development will occur (1998, p. 150).*

In Skehan's words, the emphasis has to be that of "bridging the gap between ongoing performance and sustained development" since it is by no means clear whether "introducing focus on form *at a time* will have a beneficial impact on interlanguage development *over time*" (p. 293)—once more a curricular focus.

To show how differently such an approach would play itself out in foreign-language learning, let us take as an example the already mentioned notion of fixed acquisitional sequences in language learning to which have been attached powerful claims of the learnability and teachability of certain formal features of the language (Pienemann 1985, 1989). It is well known that instructed learners of German show traces of the more advanced stages of Pienemann's five-stage model within the first few weeks of instruction. At the same time, pervasive difficulties with these grammatical features persist across a range of task environments until very late in the process of language learning (Byrnes 1998c), thereby significantly reducing the instructional utility, perhaps even the theoretical validity, of fixed developmental sequences. As Lightbown (1998) remarks, "the evidence, although suggestive, is far from overwhelming that learners benefit only from developmentally matched instruction" (p. 188). Moreover, one has to be concerned "that teachers and syllabus writers could come to treat developmental sequences as a new basis for syllabus or materials design, returning to the teaching of language features in isolation . . ." (Lightbown 1998, p. 188).

By contrast, an approach based on the notion of pedagogical tasks as suggested by Skehan (1998) would facilitate careful investigation of how tasks that have a high utility for a certain structure would, under different task conditions such as planned or unplanned speech, lead to different performance profiles and, even more intriguingly, over time foster accuracy, fluency, and complexity of language use. That would make possible a richer interpretation not only of task-induced variation, but also of all variable performance, thereby fostering a reconsideration of our notions of competence, knowledge, and performance and their respective relationships, and of fixed sequences (Bialystok 1990; Duff 1993; Gregg 1985).

One could envision a similar corrective for the prevalent assumption that humans have limited attentional capacity (see Skehan's 1998 treatment of memory). While that assumption has intuitive appeal, it can easily lead to a problematic opposition between attention to meaning as opposed to form (VanPatten 1990), thereby leading to generalizations that would seriously limit teachers' instructional choices.

One of the few studies investigating advanced collegiate learners, Leeman et al. (1995) correctly emphasizes that the issue is not to "isolate attention to form as a separate component" but to "integrate attention to form with attention to meaning" (p. 221). Again, as Tomlin and Villa (1994) note, a coarse-grained conception of attention like that implied by a limited-capacity metaphor or an automatic versus controlled processing dichotomy may be insufficient to account for addressing learners' second-language processing. Instead, much finer-grained analyses regarding attention, such as those involving alertness, orientation, and detection may be required, an approach that would seem to be particularly appropriate for adult learners whose schooling itself, as formation toward literate behaviors, fosters such behaviors.

We noted that SLA research has strongly favored an instructional environment that promotes interactive and dialogic input/intake because of its presumed consequences for comprehension. While communicative situations focusing on information gap tasks and on simple problem solving and decision making favor sentence-level language use, monologic discourse (that is perhaps open-ended, extended, and often narrative) receives less positive consideration (Duff 1993). However, as Snow (1989) observes, regarding the social antecedents for the development of monologic skills, these require a whole series of opportunities for maintaining cross-utterance and cross-speaker cohesion in pursuit of a coherent dialogic text and extensive experience with long cohesive texts. Indeed, in contrast with the sentence-level syntactic skills that are basically shared by all speakers, it is in the performance of monologic tasks, such as the retelling of a story, answering open-ended questions, giving explanations, and participating in a discussion, that large differences can be observed among learners (see also Skehan 1995). While Snow identifies these as social class differences, the fact that they are explicitly targeted at nearly all levels of native-language instruction indicates just how much consistent and careful attention is needed to develop and enlarge the kind of critical thinking and speaking abilities that literate societies—and even more so multilingual societies—require of their citizenry.

We might also wish to reconsider whether informal, unrehearsed, timed, and on the spot language use, particularly in speaking, best indicates learner abilities. Does this bias really still constitute the most productive way of researching and assessing the kind of interlanguage performance we want to foster in adult learners? At the very least, a balance that includes writing and performance under planning conditions and with various possibilities for "scaffolding" both meaning and form would seem to be in order to help us better understand and encourage advanced-level learning (Crookes 1989; Foster and Skehan 1996; Norris et al. 1998; Ochs 1979; Vygotsky 1978; Wigglesworth 1997). A shift of that kind recommends itself all the more as planning, rehearsal in memory, and cross-modal tasks that connect reading, writing, and speaking are behaviors the academic environment demands in all disciplines.

Such thinking could also lead to reinterpreting error less as the result of learners' inability to "access" what is then metaphorically taken to be "existing" knowledge, linguistic or otherwise. Particularly for more complex tasks, errorful language that affects fluency in discourse could indicate that the speaker has yet to determine precisely how to assure that both the speaker and the hearer are directing their attention to the same focus in the flow of conversation, the precondition for coherent, cohesive, and ultimately successful conversational interaction. In that critically important on-line task, meaning is neither divorced from form in speech itself, nor does it exist, in finished fashion, prior to speech. Instead, it is being dressed up in its "formal" garment during the flow of speech, a dressing up that, in turn, gives final shape to meanings (Baars 1980; Chafe 1979, 1994; Slobin 1996). As Chafe reminds us, while cognitive science has emphasized maximally abstract rules and while a linguistically based instructional approach has privileged morphological and syntactic rules of a specific language, it might be just as important to consider the shaping of meaning in consciousness

> *as the crucial interface between the conscious organism and its environment, the place where information from the environment is dealt with as a basis for thought and action as well as the place where internally generated experience becomes effective—the locus of remembering, imagining, and feeling (1994, p. 38).*

Finally, a view of language learning that limits itself to beginning levels of acquisition and does not consider the long-term developmental nature of second-language learning has little reason for dealing with one of the most fascinating aspects of learner processing that is likely to exist right from the beginning, although it does not demand direct attention until more advanced performance. I am referring to the difficulty of accounting for the phenomena of nativelike selection and nativelike fluency with our current models of language processing (Pawley and Syder 1983). For, contrary to what a syntactic-generation model based on generalizable rules seems to suggest, the native speaker community does not find equally acceptable the infinity of possible end products of such rule application. We might be able to say certain utterances and be syntactically correct, but we would likely hear "we don't say it that way," the very phenomenon advanced learners face repeatedly.

So, as implied earlier by the dual-processing model, by adhering to a linguistic-syntactic and rule-based model for language acquisition, much language teaching has been inattentive to the unique demands these features of language use place on the language learner as language user (see Bolinger 1961 for an early discussion; Pawley and Syder 1983; Skehan 1998; Widdowson 1989; Yorio 1989). Functionalist approaches (Bates and MacWhinney 1987) which require that grammar be stated in terms that express a direct relationship to semantic and pragmatic constraints, and connectionist approaches (Gasser 1990) that challenge the dominance of symbolic models in cognitive science by focusing on patterns of activation on the basis of regularities in input would, at the very least, contextualize the preferential position thus far accorded to the role of rules in the development of accuracy, fluency, and complexity of language use. Language acquisition in an instructed context could provide valuable additional evidence for those considerations.

Curriculum Construction in Foreign Language Departments: Challenges and a Response

Let us recapitulate: The sophisticated pedagogical interventions advocated under the focus on form rubric cannot be applied to most college foreign language teaching contexts because of the absence of a meaning focus. Furthermore, the findings and recommendations resulting from these studies can be chosen, implemented, and substantiated only when they are part of a long-term interlanguage development perspective in concert with other aspects of instruction—not when they are individual interventions. Only then is it possible to pass judgment on the efficacy and efficiency of these procedures.

We arrive then at a new way of asserting the interdependency of research and instruction that has always been part of our professional rhetoric, although it has been upheld more in the breach than in our conduct. In order to achieve their respective goals, both sides need to change, and they need to change toward each other. The context for exploring and implementing that change is the curriculum.

Existing Issues Affecting Curriculum Construction

As currently handled, college foreign language curricula generally are not the result of careful reflection about how to link the acquisition of meaning and form throughout a well-considered instructional program. As Byrnes (1998c) states, it is difficult to describe the aggregation of courses that constitute most undergraduate foreign language programs as a curriculum, if by "curriculum" we mean a "sequence of educational opportunities for learners that builds on internal interrelations and continuities among the major units of instruction . . . to enhance learning" (p. 265). In terms of both the selection of content and sequencing of courses, college undergraduate programs at best constitute a curriculum by default, a situation where students themselves have to create the benefits of articulated learning that would otherwise accrue from a carefully considered curriculum by design. An approach in which faculty determine students' learning needs and goals in terms of language and content tasks, categorize these needs and goals into major task types, and derive from them pedagogical tasks that reflect their likely difficulty from the standpoint of learner processing is so rare as to be virtually absent from the conduct of foreign language departments (Byrnes 1998b, 1998c).

Why is this so? First, the notion of curriculum is generally not well established among college faculty who tend, instead, to think in terms of individual courses. But the field additionally suffers from the larger educational context for foreign language learning in the American system, which relegates an inordinate part of the responsibility for teaching language to the college level but, even there, provides no substantive institutional commitment to it. It is patently absurd to believe that anything approximating any usable level of language ability—always a matter of linking meaning and form—can be acquired in the two to four semesters typically allocated to "language learning." From that perspective, curriculum construction is essentially irrelevant.

But the obstacles to curriculum construction are even higher. The deeply entrenched division between language instruction and content instruction that was already discussed is also a split in power relationships between those teaching content courses, the ordinary faculty, and those teaching the languages, term-contract lecturers, various adjuncts and part-timers, and graduate students. Recently, we have witnessed its further institutionalization through the creation of language centers that are in charge of the language teaching enterprise, thereby virtually assuring that no integrated curriculum can be built.

As a consequence, the two most important stakeholders, researchers on one side and faculty on the other, in their own ways both come to conclusions that totally contradict recent SLA research findings but which, in a wicked fashion, have their own internal logic: Curriculum construction is *neither possible nor necessary*. From the standpoint of the faculty, curriculum construction is not necessary because the split between language form and meaning is well established in the conduct of a department's program and serves the vested interests of the ordinary faculty quite well. Curriculum construction is also not possible because there is no intellectual connection between formS-focused language courses and meaning-focused content courses that are not designed to attend to learners' acquisitional needs in terms of meaning and form.

The same duality applies to SLA researchers. An emphasis on decontextualized learning of individual phenomena—many of which are formS-focused—by individual learners does not require a situated learning context within a curriculum. We are prepared to value SLA research that is conducted without considering the situatedness of learning, a stance that continues to hold even though focus on form research strongly indicates otherwise. In defense of researchers, however, in the absence of comprehensive curricular work in college foreign language departments, there seems little choice in any case.

So, instead of engaging in curriculum discussion, foreign language departments resort to two substitutes: reliance on the textbook and reliance on various methodologies. As the ritual of textbook selection amply demonstrates, the textbook often masquerades as the curriculum, an insight that has certainly not been lost on the powerful first- and second-year college textbook industry. Publishing houses come to the aid of departments that are mercifully relieved and deliciously prevented from acquiring the kind of sophisticated awareness about second-language acquisition that would lead them to the conclusion that these materials are not the most conducive for language learning. Methodology is the second curricular substitute. Once more departments seem quite defenseless and are subject to repeated pendulum swings in methodological choices. But methodological purism is a myth not only with regard to implementation on the part of the teachers (Swaffar, Arens, and Morgan 1982) but also with regard to the justification and effect individual methods can claim for themselves (e.g., Freeman 1991; Long 1985; Pennycook 1989; Pica 1991; Prabhu 1990). The result is instructional programs that are adrift, lack intellectual merit and focus, and have little basis in what must be taken to be the best knowledge in second-language acquisition research.

A Response: An Integrated Content-based Foreign Language Curriculum Initiative

The previous discussion has outlined the formidable obstacles for curriculum construction in foreign language departments, the urgent need for such work (e.g., Byrnes 1996), and the wealth of insights about meaning and form relationships that is now available in SLA research in second-language learning. Can these three aspects be brought together? Do we have at least broad guidelines, some seemingly indispensable features for such curricula within which curriculum building could be set into motion? What characteristics of these adult literate learners who are studying language in the context of American higher education might we draw on in order to pinpoint their needs, determine content areas, select task categories, and subsequently sequence the kinds of pedagogical tasks that derive from them? What consequences for pedagogies and, by implication, for faculty development does research seem to suggest if such an approach were chosen? What considerations regarding materials would follow? And, finally, what implications for assessment, short-term and long-term, would have to be contemplated?

The following pages can only begin to answer these questions in very broad terms, but they do benefit from being based on an actual comprehensive curriculum renewal project, "Developing Multiple Literacies," currently underway in my home department, the German Department at Georgetown University. Given the contentiousness of curriculum discussion, one comment that might be appropriate right at the beginning is that, assuming some common interest in student learning and a culture of cooperation, agreement on broad fundamental principles can relatively quickly lead to amicable and intelligent resolution of what was otherwise seen as an overwhelming multitude of intractable local issues. That, in turn, fosters building up a culture of joint action, common discourse around these matters, and the all-important understanding that curricula and pedagogical reflection are never finished but rather require continued attention.

Our curriculum renewal effort leaves many questions unanswered, not least because its initial construction period of three years is only two-thirds complete. But it takes seriously some insights from SLA research that I have highlighted and begins to consider their implications for curriculum and pedagogy. In the following pages I hope to provide sufficient information to invite comments to us and to stimulate discussion in the profession at large.[5]

Principles Informing this Curricular Initiative

The foundational principle underlying the curricular initiative is to make content central and to assure a favorable environment for language acquisition throughout the four-year undergraduate program. A related principle is to address meaning and form issues continuously, by carefully considering the adult learners' inherent focus on meaning and by choosing instructional interventions so that they foster accuracy, fluency, and complexity in learners' use and development of language in variable, although motivated, fashion. We subscribe to a high utility rather than to a task-essential understanding of meaning-form relationships. We do so since we neither can nor want to limit ourselves only to receptive competence, such as in reading, where one can work with fixed relationships between meaning and form (Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1993). Instead, we must include productive language use (Swain 1995), a decision that places variation, probabilities, and choices within communicative contexts at the center of our curricular, our pedagogical, and our learning philosophy.

As a result of these foundational assumptions, the curriculum no longer distinguishes between "language courses" where language is taught and learned without noteworthy connection to meaning and "content courses" where content is taught without recognizing the ongoing demand for supporting learners' acquisition of a whole range of phenomena about meaning-form connections and their performance in language use. Curriculum planners and teachers alike find themselves in a real double bind. On the one hand, even when a program aims no higher than having students learn a language to a level of competence that is somewhat resistant to attrition and loss, the few semesters of "language instruction" that are generally available are wholly insufficient—all the more so as intricate meaning-form connections in any language tend to be acquired over long periods of time. On the other hand, whether students decide to avail themselves of the opportunity for long-term study or not, critical foundations can and must be laid in those first courses for the desired interlanguage development to be at all a possibility.

By extending its vision to the four years of undergraduate study, our project differs in important ways from other curriculum-renewal efforts of roughly the last ten years (for excellent overviews of issues, see Adams 1996; Eskey 1997; Krueger and Ryan 1993; Snow and Brinton 1997; Stryker and Leaver 1997). On one hand it is considerably more ambitious in that its programmatic conceptualization envisions students attaining professional-level abilities. At the same time it is also rather conservative inasmuch as it adheres to prevailing instructional formats for language courses; that is, it does not employ innovative curricular models as others have used them to link content and language learning (Wesche 1993). Therefore it makes no unusual demands on faculty resources as these models do, particularly those that emphasize reaching into other disciplines as part of the department's mission (Anderson et al. 1993). It does, however, make considerable demands on all members of the departmental teaching staff, faculty and graduate students, with regard to their willingness to be cooperative in all matters pertaining to the curriculum and teaching, and to consider ongoing faculty development a top priority. This is an important decision and an important change in departmental culture that must be present in order to assure the long-term viability of the initiative.

Other salient points characterizing the curriculum are the following: Its content-focus is not pushed back until after completion of the basic language sequence, as in the well-known St. Olaf model (Anderson et al. 1993) or the Foreign Language Immersion Program (FLIP) at the University of Minnesota (Klee and Tedick 1997). All courses are taught by departmental faculty and graduate students, an agreement that requires all faculty to reconsider the nature of meaning-form connections in the jointly constructed syllabi in the sequenced courses on Levels I–III and, just as important, in the individually created nonsequenced courses on Levels IV and V. It is rigorous about linking content and language acquisition throughout the program, not just with supplementary texts (Jurasek 1993) or primarily as language enrichment (Anderson et al. 1993). It does not specify a particular disciplinary area for its content (e.g., Klee and Metcalf 1994) nor any particular student group as its audience (Grandin, Einbeck, and von Reinhart 1992; Vines 1997). Instead, if for no other reason than the size of our undergraduate student body, approximately 5,500 students, it is inclusive and open to all students, regardless of school affiliation or content interests.

By envisioning a four-year sequence, the curriculum acknowledges that advanced levels of language use require discourse-level abilities that are closely tied to the phenomena of literacy. Recognizing that these are developed over long periods of time and with a range of tasks, a discourse orientation pervades the entire curriculum, wherever possible building on students' interests and our assessment of what would be appropriate content knowledge for them regarding the German-speaking area. Cross-modal tasks, particularly those that incorporate reading and writing, emphasize language use above the sentence level right from the beginning. In sum, the project has the explicit ambition of teaching language and content *simultaneously* over the four-year period.

The learner needs and goals underlying the curriculum project are those I discussed earlier with the term "multiple literacies." We had the advantage of being able to draw on an extensive learner-language database from our own program that was concurrently available in conjunction with a cross-linguistic faculty-graduate student research collaborative, Foreign Language Initiatives in Research and Teaching (GU-FLIRT).[6] Insights from this research project helped specify broad learner profiles for each level, based on learner performance at two key moments of our previous instructional program—at the end of the "language sequence" and during the last semester of undergraduate study. In accordance with this information, an ideal-real learner profile was constructed for each instructional level.

The goal of the curriculum is to help students gain a multivoiced literacy that places foreign language study in the larger context of the academy and its educational mission. That focus was chosen for a number of interrelated reasons. First, we want to link our instructional program to the remainder of the university. Within its liberal arts emphasis we consider our unique contribution to be that of helping students cross the borders that inherently limit the monolingual and monocultural person, so that they may become the kind of multivoiced adults that contemporary society requires. In our estimation that contribution cannot be made at the same level of intellectual merit anywhere else. Second, we have no way of identifying our students' future real-world needs with regard to the use of German, and, therefore, cannot base curricular decision making on such information, as Long (1998), Long and Crookes (1993), and Long and Robinson (1998) demand. But we do know the real world of the institution's academic expectations in L1 and L2 and, therefore, used them to develop curricular specifications in terms of goals, tasks, knowledge and abilities, and language-processing demands.

We determined that students should acquire the ability to work critically with texts in a range of forms and to narrate in speaking and writing by the time they conclude the sequenced courses of Level III. This is an important mark since, for some of our students, it completes a requirement sequence. More important, however, thereafter they enroll in courses of their choice that reflect more closely their specific interests. Thus in order to be able to expand their narrative and textual capability into more genre- and content-specific areas and to enhance it in terms of accuracy, fluency, and complexity, a broad-based foundation needed to be created first. From this pivotal goal, we worked downward, upward, and sideways within the courses of the curriculum, identifying task types that trace textual and narrative abilities to their earliest beginnings, locating them in different contexts and across all modalities, undergirding their development through a range of pedagogical tasks, and both sequencing them consistently and interweaving them repeatedly and variably.

Undoubtedly among the most difficult and most consequential for faculty time was the decision to do away with textbooks. In stages we have come to see them as potentially particularly detrimental to realizing, in the several meanings of that word, what a content- and task-based approach to teaching and learning a language entails. Since the fall of 1997 when the project was begun (after approval of the proposal in February of that year), we have gradually replaced all standard language textbooks with a theme- and topic-focused collection of authentic materials, moving slowly in that complex process, from the Level IV Text in Context course required of majors, to Level III, the advanced courses, and ultimately downward to Level I, the introductory courses.[7]

We take the college classroom seriously as an instructional site. That means, we focus on *teaching* meaning-making cognitive and linguistic abilities that are at the heart of all critical thinking, reading, writing, and speaking. This differs from our own past practice because it significantly expands the range of content areas and texts we incorporate into our instructional program. More important, we do not assume that learners on their own are able to become aware of many of the intricate linkages between meaning and form in German, not through some unspecified transfer of their abilities in English, and particularly not for the complex discourse-based connections. Instead, we recognize that German has its unique and distinct ways, through grammar, lexicon, rhetorical structures, and genres, to link meaning and form. Therefore these need to be brought to the learners' attention in various ways throughout the program. The focus on form literature provides many suggestions in this regard, from modeling to the most explicit instructional interventions (Doughty and Williams 1998c).

Curriculum Construction and Pedagogical Implications

The totality of courses in our revised undergraduate curriculum is arranged in five levels, with Levels I–III following in sequence as explained earlier. Thereafter students choose at least one course from the five Level IV options, all of which share an emphasis on discourse phenomena and textuality that is manifested slightly differently according to the course's specific focus, such as speaking in professional contexts or writing for public fora or literary interpretation. Of these courses, Text in Context is required of the majors. Since students at this level can have dramatically different performance profiles and certainly come with different long-term intentions regarding their future engagement with German, we do not formally limit the number of Level IV courses they can take. In practice, we expect them to progress to Level V after perhaps two such courses. At Level

V the emphasis is on developing students' academic literacy, a construct that we have broken down into two major groups, classroom-based genres and/or their subskills (e.g., various forms of note taking; extensive reading for extracting evidence; plot summaries; outlining with attention to rhetorical organization; determining author stance and position; establishing the validity and reliability of data, conclusions, and inference) and real-world genres (e.g., book reviews; literature reviews comprising a number of thematically coherent secondary works; abstracting; evaluative and interpretive comments on a primary or secondary work; newspaper articles directed toward a lay audience; a conference proposal; and, finally, an academic research paper with all its preliminary stages).

Level V courses draw on all areas of academic expertise of the faculty and incorporate various theoretical perspectives and genres. As they reflect language use that characterizes a given topic, they also emphasize different aspects of such language use, from performance (e.g., in a drama course) to beginning analytical and research abilities (i.e., through reading research articles in a certain field of inquiry) to being able to connect language form with a sociopolitical and sociocultural agenda. Both for Level IV and V courses, but most likely for the entire curriculum, the thematic focus at each level may not appear to differ much from a language studies approach elsewhere. However, I take our programmatic contribution to be the extent to which we have specified our instructional foci in terms of content and genre and with a language-functional and language-processing approach. To accomplish this we have followed a sequence of steps that continuously connect the desired intellectual exploration of the chosen topics, including literary works as works of representational and imaginative verbal art, with attention to enhancing literacy and writing skills in conjunction with a discoursal and textual focus, and accuracy and complexity of language use. This is our understanding of linking themes, topics, texts, and tasks (see also Stoller and Grabe 1997).

The nature of these linkages throughout the five levels of the curriculum was extensively discussed during faculty development workshops, and materials were created by faculty-graduate student teams during the intervening summers as well as during the semesters. Among the criteria for text selection were interest level; likely background knowledge; relationship of background knowledge and students' presumed textual genre knowledge; textual transparency; and an initial preference for narrative texts over descriptive or abstractly argumentative texts. We explicitly sought variety in textual, written, auditory, audiovisual, and web-based media. In an iterative process we then connected pedagogical tasks as they made sense in light of our academic focus with texts collected on certain themes and topics and, in reverse, ascertained what formal emphases would most directly and naturally flow from the meanings conveyed in specific texts. After all, once we realized that, even with purposeful instructional interventions, much of our students' learning occurs through extensive modeling and rich input, we found the necessary flexibility in our own thinking to choose more wisely those meaning-form relationships that could and should be focused on with a particular text at a particular time—and those that should not.

Thus the ultimate decision for inclusion of a specific topical focus within a given theme and for the precise texts, particularly in Levels I–III, rested on our being able to construct pedagogical tasks that would readily arise from the content focus of the text, its characteristics of language use, and its suitability for devising appropriate pedagogical tasks. Key dimensions for the pedagogical tasks were their likely inherent task complexity in terms of processing dimensions (e.g., concrete to abstract; here and now to displaced; situated to decontextualized; narrative to descriptive and analytical), their task difficulty under different performance conditions (see the earlier discussion of Skehan), their dimensions of interactivity (interactive/dialogic—monologic; group and individual), and their purposes at a particular point at the curriculum which, themselves, could be variably constructed (see also Nunan 1993; Skehan 1996).

Central considerations for pedagogical choices were the need to balance different foci in comprehension and production; different performance emphases in terms of accuracy, fluency, and complexity; awareness of their location within the instructional sequence (e.g., introducing a formal aspect in response to a meaning focus, solidifying it, or extending its use into other task environments under different task conditions); a mix of defined and open-ended creative or cumulative tasks; a balance of individual and group work; chaining across modalities; connecting in-class and out-of-class tasks, such as e-mail discussion groups on a reading anticipating class discussion or in-class joint agreement on how to run a panel discussion leading to individual and group preparation outside of class for the upcoming panel in class.

In line with the curricular framework we have devised some pedagogical guidelines whose basis is not a particular methodology but a heightened awareness of our roles and responsibilities as teachers and of the adult learners' processing abilities, preferences, and limitations. In addition, we have prepared for each level broad descriptors and detailed statements that offer further commentary on the range of learner profiles teachers will likely encounter and on appropriate instructional emphases in terms of pedagogical tasks (see appendix materials). Such documents and insights are incorporated into our mentored TA program and continue to be discussed at a range of faculty development activities. Among the emphases are

- considering language learning a creative construction in a sociocultural context;
- renegotiating the role of the teacher as someone who primarily models, brings students' attention to meaning and form relationships, and encourages learner autonomy, responsibility, and awareness;
- renegotiating the role of the learner as someone who constructs meaning with various processing approaches and becomes a self-reflective observer of the processes of language learning;
- deliberately placing pedagogical tasks in a long-term developmental perspective;
- considering tasks in terms of learner processing demands;
- providing for a movement from pragmatic contextualized message conveyance to highly differentiated syntax and vocabulary use in formal settings—and back;
- distinguishing between what is central and what is less central at a particular level, within a particular topic or task, and setting expectations jointly with the learners;
- involving learners in the negotiation of criteria and standards for performance in tasks, and in assessment of the tasks (e.g., through the syllabus and continually in instructional emphases, input, and feedback);
- integrating assessment into task performance;
- being aware of the tension between necessary challenge and necessary comfort level in order to advance learning that links all modalities; and

- watching for stages, thresholds, consolidations, restructurings, and U-turns, and responding to them with different interventions that keep learners affectively and cognitively engaged and appropriately supported pedagogically.

At present we are comprehensively dealing with assessment issues that obviously loom large with such a far-reaching revamping of curricular and pedagogical assumptions and goals.[8] This is an ongoing project that has already made us much more alert to our own often unexamined practices, aside from giving us much valuable information about our students' learning and their generally favorable reception of this project. The desired detailed analyses of their linguistic capabilities are projects that remain to be accomplished. However, no matter how in-depth such descriptions may ultimately be, we will be unable to offer proud "before-and-after" statements about the efficacy of this curriculum project, if for no other reason than a lack of a basis of comparison: Never before have we known as much about our students' learning as we do now!

We can, however, say without the slightest hesitation that this project has dramatically changed our entire departmental culture in ways that none of us anticipated or would have thought possible. Does this really matter beyond the inherent value of cooperative behavior and a heightened sense of our responsibilities toward our students? I believe it does, for I am unable to imagine how the intricate understandings about the relationship of meaning and language now available in research, teaching, and learning, and about the phenomenon of second language learning, particularly for adult instructed learners, could otherwise have entered our thinking and our actions in such a profoundly formative way. That, in itself, is worthy of reflection, not only from the standpoint of college foreign language departments but also from the standpoint of the SLA research community.

Notes

1. Preparation of this paper was supported in part by an Adjunct Fellowship at the National Foreign Language Center, Washington, D.C., during the summer of 1998. The curricular initiative to which this paper refers is the result of extensive collaboration among all members of the German Department at Georgetown University, faculty and graduate students. An ongoing project, some of its major assumptions and forms of implementation are documented at www.georgetown.edu/departments/german/byrnes.

2. While Freeman uses this phrasing to address needs for future teacher education, it is just as applicable for rejuvenating entire foreign language departments.
3. Doughty and Williams (1998a) provide an SLA researcher-oriented overview of the issues; Doughty (1998) and Spada (1997) provide a discussion for nonspecialists. Long and Crookes (1992, 1993) and Long and Robinson (1998) extensively treat curricular issues and foreign/second language pedagogy.
4. See Rafael Salaberry's article "The Role of Input and Output Practice in Second Language Acquisition" in the *Canadian Modern Language Review* 53.2 (1997): 422–451, the reply by Cristina Sanz and Bill VanPatten, "On Input Processing, Processing Instruction, and the Nature of Replication Tasks: A Response to Salaberry," *Canadian Modern Language Review* 54.2 (1998): 263–273, and Salaberry's reply in the same issue, "On Input Processing, True Language Competence, and Pedagogical Bandwagons: A Reply to Sanz and VanPatten," pp. 274–285.
5. For further details I refer readers to the departmental website that documents this project through various overview and policy documents, course syllabi, and assessment instruments. We would be particularly pleased to receive comments:
   www.georgetown.edu/departments/ german/byrnes.
6. An overview of this project is also provided at the web address www.georgetown.edu/departments/german/byrnes.
7. The decision to retain a textbook for Level I results from a number of conflicting considerations. Some of these have less to do with our curricular and pedagogical convictions than they do with student expectations about what constitutes "real" instruction in a foreign language. Also, there is the constant need to bring new graduate students on board, along with the faculty also rotating through this level. Ultimately, the possibility of "undermining" an existing textbook with materials of our own choosing to such an extent that it will socialize students into the program in the appropriate fashion right from the beginning led to the choice that was made.
8. Here I would like to acknowledge with much gratitude the outstanding work being done within our curriculum project by John Norris, a Ph.D. candidate in the Applied Linguistics program at the University of Hawai'i, who has spent the spring semester and the summer of 1999

with us, observing classes, meeting with faculty at the various instructional levels, and helping us align our assessment approach, both within individual classes and for this content- and task-based curriculum as a whole, with our goals and our pedagogical approaches. Some of the materials that were used in faculty development workshops as well as questionnaires given to students and faculty are included in the website. A key project for summer 1999 and the academic year 1999–2000 was to create and implement a new placement test that better reflected our entire instructional approach.

Works Cited

Adams, Thomas M. 1996. Languages across the Curriculum: Taking Stock. *ADFL Bulletin* 28: 9–19.

Anderson, Keith O., Wendy Allen, and León Narváez. 1993. The Applied Foreign Language Component in the Humanities and the Sciences. In *Language and Content: Discipline- and Content-based Approaches to Language Study*, edited by Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan, 103–113. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Baars, Bernard J. 1980. The Competing Plans Hypothesis: An Heuristic Viewpoint on the Causes of Errors in Speech. In *Temporal Variables in Speech*, edited by Hans W. Dechert and Manfred Raupach, 39–49. The Hague: Mouton.

Bailey, Kathleen M., and David Nunan, eds. 1996. *Voices From the Language Classroom. Qualitative Research in Second Language Education.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bates, Elizabeth, and Brian MacWhinney. 1987. Competition, Variation and Language Learning. In *Mechanisms of Language Acquisition*, edited by Brian MacWhinney, 157–194. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bialystok, Ellen. 1990. The Competence of Processing: Classifying Theories of Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 24: 635–648.

_______. 1994. Analysis and Control in the Development of a Second Language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 157–168.

Biber, Douglas. 1986. Spoken and Written Textual Dimensions in English: Resolving the Contradictory Findings. *Language* 62: 384–414.

Bolinger, Dwight L. 1961. Syntactic Blends and Other Matters. *Language* 37: 366–381.

Byrnes, Heidi. 1992. Response to Rebecca Valette's "Proficiency and the Prevention of Fossilization—An Editorial." *Modern Language Journal* 75: 325–328.

______. 1996. The Future of German in American Education. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 29: 251–259.

______. 1998a. Introduction: Steps to an Ecology of Foreign Language Departments. In *Learning Foreign and Second Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship,* edited by Heidi Byrnes, 1–22. New York: MLA.

______. 1998b. Constructing Curricula in Collegiate Foreign Language Departments. In *Learning Foreign and Second Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship,* edited by Heidi Byrnes, 262–295. New York: MLA.

______. 1998c. Acquiring Academic Language Abilities: Report on a German TA Immersion Institute. Paper presented at the 1998 ACTFL/AATG Conference, 21 November, Chicago.

Carr, Thomas H., and Tim Curran. 1994. Cognitive Factors in Learning about Structured Sequences: Applications to Syntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 205–230.

Chafe, Wallace. 1979. The Flow of Thought and the Flow of Language. In *Syntax and Semantics,* vol. 12, edited by Talmy Givón, 159–181. New York: Academic Press.

______. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chaudron, Craig. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Coughlan, Peter, and Patricia A. Duff. 1994. Same Task, Different Activities. Analysis of an SLA Task from an Activity Theory Perspective. In *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research,* edited by James P. Lantolf and Gabriela Appel, 173–193. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Crookes, Graham. 1986. *Task Classification: A Cross-Disciplinary Review.* Technical Report no. 4. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Social Science Research Institute, Center for Second Language Classroom Research.

______. 1989. Planning and Interlanguage Variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11: 367–383.

Crookes, Graham, and Susan M. Gass, eds. 1993a. *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

______, eds. 1993b. *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dechert, Hans W. 1983. How a Story Is Done in a Second Language. In *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, edited by Claus Faerch and Gabriele Kasper, 175–195. New York: Longman.

DeKeyser, Robert M. 1998. Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing L2 Grammar. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 42–63. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, Catherine. 1998. Acquiring Competence in a Second Language: Form and Function. In *Learning Foreign and Second Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship*, edited by Heidi Byrnes, 128–156. New York: MLA.

Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams, eds. 1998a. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

______. 1998b. Issues and Terminology. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 1–11. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

______. 1998c. Pedagogical Choices in Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 197–261. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, Patricia A. 1993. Tasks and Interlanguage Performance: An SLA Research Perspective. In *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 57–95. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, Nick C., and Alan Beaton. 1995. Psycholinguistic Determinants of Foreign Language Vocabulary Learning. In *Lexical Issues in Language Learning*, edited by Birgit Harley, 107–165. Ann Arbor, MI: John Benjamins.

Eskey, David E. 1997. Syllabus Design in Content-Based Instruction. In *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*, edited by Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton, 132–141. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Foley, Joseph. 1991. A Psycholinguistic Framework for Task-Based Approaches to Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 12: 62–75.

Foster, Pauline, and Peter Skehan. 1996. The Influence of Planning and Task Type on Second Language Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 299–323.

Fotos, Sandra. 1993. Consciousness Raising and Noticing through Focus on Form: Grammar Task Performance Versus Formal Instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 14: 385–407.

Fotos, Sandra, and Rod Ellis. 1993. Communicating about Grammar: A Task-Based Approach. *TESOL Quarterly* 25: 605–628.

Freeman, Donald. 1991. 'Mistaken Constructs': Re-Examining the Nature and Assumptions of Language Teacher Education. In *Linguistics and Language Pedagogy* (GURT'91), edited by James E. Alatis, 25–39. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

______. 1994. Educational Linguistics and the Knowledge Base of Language Teaching. In *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence* (GURT'94), edited by James E. Alatis, 180–198. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Gass, Susan M. 1997. *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gass, Susan, and Alison Mackey, guest eds. 1998. *The Role of Input and Interaction in Second Language Acquisition.* Special issue of *The Modern Language Journal* 82: 3.

Gass, Susan, and Evangeline Marlos Varonis. 1985. Task Variation and Nonnative/Nonnative Negotiation of Meaning. In *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Susan M. Gass and Carolyn G. Madden, 149–161. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gasser, Michael. 1990. Connectionism and Universals of Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 179–199.

Grandin, John M., Kandace Einbeck, and Walter von Reinhart. 1992. The Changing Goals of Language Instruction. In *Languages for a Multicul-*

tural World in Transition, edited by Heidi Byrnes, 123–163. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Gregg, Kevin. 1985. Krashen's Monitor and Occam's Razor. *Applied Linguistics* 5: 79–100.

Greene, Judith. 1995. Language Processes and Models. In *Language Understanding: Current Issues.* 2d ed., edited by Judith Greene and Mark Coulson, 51–89. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Hammerly, Hector. 1991. Two Philosophies of Language Program and Language Testing Design. In *Assessing Foreign Language Proficiency of Undergraduates*, edited by Richard V. Teschner, 61–78. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Harley, Birgit, and Merrill Swain. 1984. The Interlanguage of Immersion Students and Its Implications for Second Language Teaching. In *Interlanguage*, edited by Alan Davies, C. Criper, and A. P. R. Howatt, 291–311. Edinburgh, Scot.: Edinburgh University Press.

James, Dorothy. 1989. Reshaping the "College-level" Curriculum: Problems and Possibilities. In *Shaping the Future. Challenges and Opportunities*, edited by Helen S. Lepke, 79–110. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

Jurasek, Richard. 1993. Foreign Languages across the Curriculum: A Case History from Earlham College and a Generic Rationale. *Language and Content. Discipline- and Content-Based Approaches to Language Study*, edited by Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan, 85–102. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Klee, Carol A., and Michael F. Metcalf. 1994. Perspectives on Foreign Languages across the Curriculum Based on the University of Minnesota Experience. In *Languages across the Curriculum. Translation Perspectives*, edited by H. Stephen Straight, 101–115. Binghamton, NY: State University of New York.

Klee, Carol A., and Diane Tedick. 1997. The Undergraduate Foreign Language Immersion Program in Spanish at the University of Minnesota. In *Content-Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education*, edited by Stephen B. Stryker and Betty Lou Leaver, 140–173. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

______. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis. Issues and Implications.* London: Longman.

Krashen, Stephen, and Tracy D. Terrell. 1983. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom.* Oxford, UK/San Francisco, CA: Pergamon/Alemany.

Krueger, Merle, and Frank Ryan. 1993. Resituating Foreign Languages in the Curriculum. In *Language and Content. Discipline- and Content-Based Approaches to Language Study,* edited by Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan, 3–24. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1993. The Name of the Task and the Task of Naming: Methodological Aspects of Task-Based Pedagogy. In *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice,* edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 69–96. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1983.Training Teachers or Educating a Teacher. In *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Toward a Rationale (GURT '83),* edited by James E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, and Peter Strevens, 269–274. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Leeman, Jennifer, Igone Arteagoitia, Boris Fridman, and Catherine Doughty. 1995. Integrating Attention to Form with Meaning: Focus on Form in Content-Based Spanish Instruction. In *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning,* Technical Report no. 9, edited by Richard Schmidt, 217–258. University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Lightbown, Patsy M. 1998. The Importance of Timing in Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 177–196. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, Patsy M., and Nina Spada. 1990. Focus-on-Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 429–448.

Long, Michael H. 1985. A Role for Instruction in Second Language Acquisition: Task-based Language Teaching. In *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Kenneth Hyltenstam and Manfred Pienemann, 77–99. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

______. 1989. Task, Group, and Task-Group Interactions. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL* 8: 1–26.

______. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, edited by Kees de Bot, Ralph B. Ginsberg, and Claire Kramsch, 39–52. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

______. 1994. On the Advocacy of the Task-Based Syllabus. *TESOL Quarterly* 28: 782–790.

______. 1998. Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL* 16: 35–49.

Long, Michael H., and Graham Crookes. 1992. Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design. *TESOL Quarterly* 26: 27–56.

______. 1993. Units of Analysis in Syllabus Design: The Case for Task. In *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 9–54. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Long, Michael H., and Peter Robinson. 1998. Focus on Form: Theory, Research, and Practice. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 15–41. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Loschky, Lester, and Robert Bley-Vroman. 1993. Grammar and Task-Based Methodology. In *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 123–167. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mackey, Alison. In press. Input, Interaction, and Second Language Development: An Empirical Study of Question Formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21: 4.

MacWhinney, Brian. 1987. The Competition Model. In *Mechanisms of Language Acquisition*, edited by Brian MacWhinney, 249–308. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

New London Group. 1996. A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures. *Harvard Educational Review* 66: 60–92.

Norris, John M., James D. Brown, Thom Hudson, and Jim Yoshioka. 1998. *Designing Second Language Performance Assessments.* University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Nunan, David. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

______. 1993. Task-Based Syllabus Design: Selecting, Grading and Sequencing Tasks. In *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 55–68. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Planned and Unplanned Discourse. In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 12, edited by Talmy Givón, 51–80. New York: Academic Press.

Pawley, Andrew, and Frances Syder. 1983. Two Puzzles for Linguistic Theory: Nativelike Selection and Nativelike Fluency. *Language and Communication*, edited by Jack Richards and Richard Schmidt, 191–225. London: Longman.

Pennycook, Alastair. 1989. The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 23: 589–618.

Pica, Teresa. 1991. The Language Educator at Work in the Learner-Centered Classroom: Communicate, Decision-Make, and Remember to Apply the (Educational) Linguistics. In *Educational Linguistics* (GURT '91), edited by James E. Alatis, 264–288. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

______. 1992. The Textual Outcomes of Native Speaker-Non-Native Speaker Negotiation: What Do They Reveal about Second Language Learning? In *Text and Context: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch and Sally McConnell-Ginet, 198–237. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

______. 1994. Research on Negotiation: What Does It Reveal about Second-Language Learning Conditions, Processes and Outcomes? *Language Learning* 44: 493–527.

Pica, Teresa, Ruth Kanagy, and Joseph Falodun. 1993. Choosing and Using Communication Tasks for Second Language Instruction. In *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 9–34. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pica, Teresa, Richard Young, and Catherine Doughty. 1987. The Impact of Interaction on Comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly* 21: 737–758.

Pienemann, Manfred. 1985. Learnability and Syllabus Construction. In *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Kenneth Hyltenstam and Manfred Pienemann, 23–75. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

______. 1989. Is Language Teachable? Psycholinguistic Experiments and Hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics* 10: 52–79.

Pienemann, Manfred, and Malcolm Johnston. 1986. An Acquisition-Based Procedure for Second Language Assessment (ESL). *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 9: 92–112.

Plough, India, and Susan M. Gass. 1993. Interlocutor and Task Familiarity: Effects on Interactional Structure. In *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 35–56. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Prabhu, N. S. 1990. There Is No Best Method—Why? *TESOL Quarterly* 24: 161–176.

Robinson, Peter. 1994. Implicit Knowledge, Second Language Learning, and Syllabus Construction (Comments on Rod Ellis' "The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition"). *TESOL Quarterly* 28: 161–166.

______. 1995a. Review Article: Attention, Memory, and the "Noticing" Hypothesis. *Language Learning* 45: 283–331.

______. 1995b. Task Complexity and Second Language Narrative Discourse. *Language Learning* 45: 99–140.

______. In press. Task Complexity, Cognition and Second Language Syllabus Design: A Triadic Framework for Examining Task Influences on SLA. In *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, edited by Peter Robinson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, Peter, S. C. C. Ting, and J. J. Erwin. 1995. Investigating Second Language Task Complexity. *RELC Journal* 26: 62–79.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 1998. The Development of Aspectual Distinctions in Academic L2 French. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 54: 508–542.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. Discovering the Context of an Utterance. *Linguistics* 25: 11–32.

Schmidt, Richard, ed. 1995a. *Attention and Awareness in Foreign*

Language Learning. University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

______. 1995b. Consciousness and Foreign Language Learning: A Tutorial on the Role of Attention and Awareness in Learning. *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, Technical Report no. 9, edited by Richard Schmidt, 1–63. University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Segalowitz, Norman. 1995. Does Advanced Skill in a Second Language Reduce Automaticity in the First Language? In *Lexical Issues in Language Learning*, edited by Birgit Harley, 81–103. Ann Arbor, MI: John Benjamins.

Segalowitz, Norman, Vivien Watson, and Sidney Segalowitz. 1995. Vocabulary Skill: Single-Case Assessment of Automaticity of Word Recognition in a Timed Lexical Decision Task. *Second Language Research* 11: 121–136.

Selinker, Larry. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 10: 209–231.

Sharwood Smith, Michael. 1993. Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical Bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 165–179.

Skehan, Peter. 1995. Analysability, Accessibility, and Ability for Use. In *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics. Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson*, edited by Guy Cook and Barbara Seidlhofer, 91–106. New York: Oxford University Press.

______. 1996. A Framework for the Implementation of Task-Based Instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 17: 38–62.

______. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, Dan I. 1996. From "Thought and Language" to "Thinking for Speaking." *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, edited by John J. Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson, 70–96. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, Catherine E. 1989. "Understanding Social Interaction and Language Acquisition: Sentences Are Not Enough." In *Interaction in Human Development*, edited by M. Bornstein and Jerome Bruner, 83–103. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Snow, Marguerite Ann, and Donna M. Brinton, eds. 1997. *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Spada, Nina. 1997. Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Acquisition: A Review of Classroom and Laboratory Research. *Language Teaching* 30: 73–87.

Stoller, Fredricka L., and William Grabe. 1997. A Six-T's Approach to Content-Based Instruction. In *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content,* edited by Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton, 78–94. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Stryker, Stephen B., and Betty Lou Leaver, eds. 1997. *Content-Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education: Models and Methods.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Swaffar, Janet, Katherine Arens, and Heidi Byrnes. 1991. *Reading for Meaning. An Integrated Approach to Language Learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Swaffar, Janet, Katherine Arens, and Martha Morgan. 1982. Teacher Classroom Practices: Redefining Method as Task Hierarchy. *Modern Language Journal* 66: 24–33.

Swain, Merrill, 1985. Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development. In *Input in Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Susan M. Gass and Carolyn G. Madden, 235–253. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

______. 1995. Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning. In *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson,* edited by Guy Cook and Barbara Seidlhofer, 125–144. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, Merrill, and Sharon Lapkin, 1989. Canadian Immersion and Adult Second Language Teaching: What's the Connection? *Modern Language Journal* 73: 150–159.

Tedick, Diane J., and Constance L. Walker. 1994. Second Language Teacher Education: The Problems That Plague Us. *Modern Language Journal* 38: 300–312.

Thomas, Margaret. 1998. Programmatic Ahistoricity in Second Language Acquisition Theory. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20: 387–405.

Tomasello, Michael, and Carol Herron. 1988. Down the Garden Path: Inducing and Correcting Overgeneralization Errors in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 9: 237–246.

Tomlin, Russell S., and Victor Villa. 1994. Attention in Cognitive Science and Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 183–204.

Valette, Rebecca. 1991. Proficiency and the Prevention of Fossilization—An Editorial. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 325–328.

Van Lier, Leo. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner: Ethnography and Second-language Classroom Research.* New York: Longman.

______. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy, and Authenticity.* New York: Longman.

VanPatten, Bill. 1990. Attending to Form and Content in the Input: An Experiment in Consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 287–301.

______. 1994. Evaluating the Roles of Consciousness in Second Language Acquisition: Terms, Linguistic Features and Research Methodologies. *AILA Review* 11: 27–36.

______. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction in Second Language Acquisition.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

______. 1998. Cognitive Characteristics of Adult Second Language Learners. In *Learning Foreign and Second Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship,* edited by Heidi Byrnes, 105–127. New York: MLA.

VanPatten, Bill, and Teresa Cadierno. 1993. Explicit Instruction and Input Processing. In *The Role of Instruction in Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Patsy M. Lightbown, Nina Spada, and Lydia White. *Special Issue of Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15: 225–243.

Vines, Lois. 1997. Content-based Instruction in French for Journalism Students at Ohio University. In *Content-Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education: Models and Methods,* edited by Stephen B. Stryker and Betty Lou Leaver, 118–140. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Vygotsky, Lev. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes,* edited by Michael Cole, et al. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wesche, Marjorie Bingham. 1993. Discipline-Based Approaches to Language Study: Research Issues and Outcomes. In *Language and Content. Discipline- and Content-Based Approaches to Language Study*, edited by Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan, 5–82. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Widdowson, Henry G. 1989. Knowledge of Language and Ability for Use. *Applied Linguistics* 10: 128–137.

Wigglesworth, Gillian. 1997. An Investigation of Planning Time and Proficiency Level on Oral Test Discourse. *Language Testing* 14: 85–106.

Yorio, Carlos A. 1989. Idiomaticity As an Indicator of Second Language Proficiency. In *Bilingualism across the Lifespan: Aspects of Acquisition, Maturity, and Loss*, edited by Kenneth Hyltenstam and Loraine K. Obler, 55–72. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, George, Maggie Powers, and Doris Macdonald. 1992. The Variable Effects of Some Task-Based Learning Procedures on L2 Communicative Effectiveness. *Language Learning* 42: 249–277.

Appendix

Developing Multiple Literacies— An Integrated Content-based Curriculum

Overview of Curricular Sequence

A. Sequenced Courses

Level I: Experiencing the German-speaking World

Introductory German I and II: (2 semesters: 3 credits each) OR Intensive Basic German: (1 semester: 6 credits)

The themes for this level are coordinated with the textbook, but a significant amount of authentic outside material (e.g., videos, Gordon Craig *The Germans*) is brought in to reshape the emphasis of the book toward a content focus. (Extensive pedagogical work is planned with a newly chosen textbook for the summer of 1999.)

Level II: Contemporary Germany

Intermediate German I and II: (2 semesters: 3 credits each) OR Intensive Intermediate German: (1 semester: 6 credits)

Deutschland nach der Wende/*Germany after the Fall of the Wall*

Heimat/Ausländer/*A Sense of Home and Being Foreign*
Identität in anderen Ländern: Österreich und die Schweiz/*Identity in Other Countries: Austria and Switzerland*
Familie, Arbeit und Gesellschaft/*The Family, the World of Work, and Society*
Natur, Mensch und Umwelt/*Nature, Man, and Environment*
Literatur: Märchen/*Literature: Fairytales*
(Extensive reading: Patrick Süskind, *Die Geschichte von Herrn Sommer*)
(Additional pedagogical work is planned for the summer of 1999.)

Level III: Stories and Histories

Advanced German I and II: (2-semester sequence: 3 credits each) OR Intensive Advanced German: (1-semester course: 6 credits)

Deutschland nach 1945: Kriegsende, deutsche Teilung, Wiederaufbau/*Germany after 1945: End of the War, the Division of Germany, and Reconstruction*
Zwei deutsche Staaten/*Two German States*
Der Fall der Mauer und seine Konsequenzen/*The Fall of the Wall and Its Consequences*
Persönliche und nationale Identität: Deutschland als multikulturelle Gesellschaft/*Personal and National Identity: Germany as a Multicultural Society*
(English background material: Mary Fulbrook, *History of Germany in the 20th Century*)
(Barbara Honigmann, *Eine Liebe aus nichts*)

B. Nonsequenced Courses

Level IV: Text in Context

(1-semester course: 4 credits)

Von der Gegenwart der Vergangenheit/*The Presence of the Past (Emphasis on the Holocaust)*
Hochschulreform/*Reform of Higher Education*
Mitten in Europa/*Germany and European Integration—Challenges and Opportunities*
(Hans Werner Richter, *Damals war es Friedrich*)

In addition to *Text in Context* the following courses belong to Level IV: *Topics for Oral Proficiency: Issues and Trends 2000; Business German (Volkswirtschaft); Business German (Betriebswirtschaft);* and one literature course. At least one Level IV course of the student's choice is required. These courses share an emphasis on discourse phenomena and textuality that is manifested differently in each of them. Beyond that, they set their own focus (e.g., speaking in a professional context, in public settings, writing that reflects the approaches to and conventions of literary/cultural interpretation.)

Level V

The remaining courses in the German department are designated as Level V courses. Through exploring topics primarily in 18th through 20th century German studies and selected topics in German linguistics, they aim to develop students' academic literacy. The construct of "academic literacy" is addressed through two major genres: classroom-based genres or their subskills and "real-world" genres.

Future course development will focus on this level. Among recently designed courses that strive to incorporate the new curricular goals are *Mysteries, Madness, and Murder: German Responses to Modernity; Look Who's Laughing: German Comedy; Berlin Stories 1918–2000; Inside Out: Voices from Germany; Survey of German Literature; Kafka; Turn of the Century Vienna; Narrative and Memory; Reformation to Freud: German Civilization; Writing our Selves—Writing our Times: Letters, Diaries, Essays; Crossing Borders—the Native and the Foreign; Grim(m) Fairy Tales; Germany in Europe.*

Note: In order to gain a better understanding of the instructional approaches that characterize these courses, readers are encouraged to consult the detailed description of the levels and the Assessment page, particularly the overall policy statement, as well as the assessment specifications for Levels I–IV found on the departmental website.

Overall Descriptors for Level Goals

Level I: Experiencing the German-Speaking World

Students develop a sense of themselves as intelligent and respected learners/users of German, based on a continuously modeled and re-created classroom culture that focuses on the communication of meaning and greater understanding of others and themselves.

The overall goal of Level I courses is to help students develop knowledge about the cultures of German-speaking countries and, through that content, acquire linguistic knowledge that allows them to feel comfortable thinking of themselves as users of German, in listening, reading, writing, and speaking. Level I courses introduce students culturally to one's self and others (family and friends), referring to activities and events (in present and past storytelling), occupations and pastimes (school, work, and free time), and the world around us (environment, residence, etc.). Comparisons to current German life and society build the foundation for cultural literacy and familiarity with the German-speaking world.

Reflecting the content focus of our curriculum this course favors a communicative approach that highlights critical reading and writing right from the beginning. Students work with a variety of text types in a variety of media, in comprehension and production. These range from personal and interactional to routine public. At the end of the year they should be able to communicate effectively beyond immediate and person-centered areas of interest, incorporating broader cultural knowledge into a variety of topics and issues.

A mosaic of activities that put meaning in the center at the same time attends to gradual but continual development of accurate and differentiated language abilities in all modalities. That is, throughout the level, we emphasize effective and meaningful communication in which linguistic accuracy is an important long-term goal. Creativity, breadth of expression (through syntax and vocabulary), and variation of language ("style") in different social contexts and for different tasks are critical to long-term achievement. Assessment of progress will occur across all modalities and throughout the level.

Level II: Contemporary Germany

Students consolidate their syntactic awareness and increasingly routinize major sentence patterns, freeing up processing space for greater creativity within these boundaries.

Level II courses are organized topically to familiarize students with contemporary life in Germany. They place particular emphasis on the story in a German context—personal, public, and literary stories. Students will begin to develop self-expression across a variety of culturally and politically significant topics, thereby increasing both accuracy and fluency of comprehension and expression in all modalities—listening, speaking, writing, reading. The topics expand on those in Level I and lay the groundwork for those in Level III. Independent progress is emphasized through portfolio assessment of written and spoken production. Exposure to various text types and personal engagement in intensive study forms the foundation for future independent ability to access and work with German materials, the focus of Level III.

Level III: Stories and Histories

Students begin to reorganize their grammar from sentence-level processing to discourse-level processing. At the same time they are ready to be challenged by accuracy of use and some fluency at the local level (inflectional and derivational morphology, gender, noun plurals, case relationships, and markings). This challenge is set up at Level III and will continue particularly at Level IV and into Level V.

Level III courses are designed to give students a thorough understanding of contemporary German history (1945–present) and contemporary social issues, while improving their proficiency in German in all four modalities (writing, reading, speaking, listening).

The thematic sequence emphasizes personal and public stories throughout German history, while connecting oral narratives with written narratives. Students improve their ability to narrate, compare and contrast, and establish causal relationships in speaking and writing. Through the integration of all modalities, this course promotes accuracy, fluency, and complexity in language use. The development of advanced reading and writing is considered the primary means for expanding students' language abilities at this level of instruction.

In addition, students learn how to evaluate their own language learning and to set objectives for the improvement of their abilities and knowledge. Students engage in both independent and group projects through which they learn to evaluate their own performance. Speaking ability is enhanced through class discussion, group work, and panel discussions. By incorporating a range of textual sources and tasks, students have the opportunity to move from personal forms of communication to more public uses of language.

Students are encouraged to take increasing responsibility for their own learning. The courses focus on a theme for an extended period, so that students encounter multiple perspectives and genres in both written and oral forms. Students master theme-related vocabulary through repeated exposure and integrated tasks. By reading independently and working collaboratively through texts, students increase their understanding of textual organization and the way German structures are used to express ideas both orally and in writing. Students become increasingly proficient in shifting between personal and public forms of communication.

Level IV

Further stabilization of discourse-level processing in terms of accuracy and fluency, now deliberately expanded to complexity/variation. Students' performance variation is likely to increase even further. It is critical that students now take responsibility for their own learning. Through careful observation, teachers can guide their continued progress in learning; by agreeing on an individualized learning trajectory and identifying the most useful learning strategies, continued progress is made possible.

A small group of courses has been designated as Level IV courses (see previous overview). With their focus on discourse features and textuality, all Level IV courses build upon a number of intricately interrelated and at times sequenced pedagogical tasks that raise students' awareness of and ability to use those features. These tasks focus on prominent characteristics of public discourse (monologic and interactive), textual organization, genre, the relationship of author stance and intention to language use, expanded syntactic patterns, and differentiated thematic vocabulary, including, as appropriate, special characteristics of literary language. Students' ability to produce high-level oral and written language is enhanced through the opportunity to practice and perform a series of previously identified subcomponents or subskills (e.g., through class activities and/or homework assignments).

At this level, the curriculum's overall emphasis on students' responsibility for their own learning becomes more prominent as students set specific individual learning goals within the course goals and objectives. As students progress through the curriculum, their performance profiles are likely to become highly divergent even though they are appropriately enrolled in a particular course. Therefore it is particularly critical to continue to work toward a balance between accuracy, fluency, and complexity of language use, something that is crucial for continued interlanguage development toward target language norms by the advanced learner.

Level IV: Text in Context

This is the last course in the required sequence for majors. Working at some depth with three topics, it is designed to help students gain in German a level of fluency and accuracy that enables them to live and study in a German-speaking country.

Building on the primarily contextualized, highly personal stories of Level III, it aims to familiarize students with public and academic forms of language. Therefore it makes explicit linkages between the literate forms of language use in reading and writing and more advanced forms of oral expression. Through this integrated text-based approach, students will gradually shift their language use from oral to more literate forms of expression in all modalities. They acquire differentiated vocabulary and greater grammatical accuracy, fluency, and complexity by focusing on the relationship between meaning/content and linguistic forms. They become sensitive to language use with different textual genres in different communicative situations where the participants have different communicative goals. They emulate such language use in a variety of assignments. Work inside and outside the classroom includes textual analysis and interpretation for enhancing reading comprehension in both intensive and extensive reading; creative, journalistic, essayistic, and academic writing in a process-writing approach; and listening comprehension with diverse audiovisual materials through outlining and note taking.

Students begin to develop the kinds of literacy skills that are at the heart of summarizing, interpreting, critiquing, presenting, and substantiating an opinion or argument and to be able to practice these skills orally and in writing. Such language use is critical for study abroad as well as any other professional context in which the German language is used.

Level V: Courses

At this level our program leading students toward *multiple literacy* within a content-based curriculum comes together: In terms of elaborated content-knowledge about the German-speaking cultural area, a high level of sensitivity and reflectivity and interpretive skill toward other and self in a cultural context, and the ability to function in the German language with academic-level proficiency in terms of accuracy, fluency, and complexity of language use in a variety of contexts.

These courses comprise the remainder of the offerings in the undergraduate curriculum. Course offerings include cultural, literary, and linguistic topics incorporating various theoretical perspectives and genres. Reflecting language use that characterizes a given topic, they emphasize different aspects of language, from performance (e.g., in a drama course) to beginning analytical and research abilities (i.e., through reading research articles in a certain field of inquiry) to being able to connect language use with a sociopolitical and sociocultural agenda. Throughout, intellectual exploration of the topics is connected with attention to developing appropriate literacy and writing skills in conjunction with textual analysis and accuracy and complexity of language use.

Two types of genres provide the basis for a range of tasks that support students' development of academic literacy: classroom-based genres or their subskills and "real-world" genres. As appropriate, faculty teaching these courses mentor students through the extended process of writing a research paper, from topic selection and delimitation to bibliography preparation, preparation of drafts, and final submission of the polished paper.

PART III

Pedagogical Applications

TOWARD A PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE GRAMMAR: TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING WORD-ORDER CONSTRUCTIONS

Carl S. Blyth
University of Texas at Austin[1]

Introduction

During the past decade, scholars in foreign language pedagogy have increasingly urged teachers to reexamine their commonly held practice of teaching grammar based on examples of decontextualized sentences taken primarily from the written language (Barnes 1990; Blyth 1997; Celce-Murcia 1990; Celce-Murcia et al. 1997; Fox 1993; Garrett 1986; Hatch 1992; Hershensohn 1988; Kramsch 1981, 1983, 1984; Lee and VanPatten 1995; Long 1991; McCarthy 1991; Riggenbach 1990; Rutherford 1987). In place of the traditional sentential approaches to grammar, these scholars have advocated a concept of grammar in terms of connected discourse, that is, actual language use, multipropositional speech and writing, so-called "real communication" (Cooreman and Kilborn 1990). Such a functional or discourse-oriented approach to grammar instruction requires a radical shift in perspective from traditional approaches: "[In functional approaches] grammar is not a set of rigid rules that must be followed in order to produce grammatical sentences. Rather, grammar is a set of strategies that one employs in order to produce coherent communication" (Givón 1993, p. 1).

According to Tomlin (1994), what sets functional grammars apart from other types of grammar is what he calls the "communicative imperative," the premise that "linguistic form generally serves to code or signal linguistic function and that shapes taken by linguistic form arise out of the demands of communicative interactions" (p. 144). Like all grammars, functional grammars pursue description and explanation of language patterns. However, the main focus of functional linguistics is the interaction of form and function. One of the best examples of form-function interaction is pragmatically conditioned word order. Consider the following set of word-order constructions from which English speakers may choose in (1):

(1)
a. John kissed Mary.
b. Mary was kissed by John.
c. It was John who kissed Mary.
d. It was Mary who was kissed by John.
e. What John did was kiss Mary.
f. Who John kissed was Mary.
g. Mary, John kissed her.
(Brown and Yule 1983, p. 127)

The same information or propositional content is expressed in each sentence. So why does English, or any other language, need so many ways to say the same thing? The reason is that speakers and listeners use language forms to communicate, and communication is a tricky business. Speakers need to package (and sometimes repackage) information so that the intended message gets through. Consider the following exchange in (2):

(2)
"So, Mary kissed John, did she?
"No, you got it backwards. It was JOHN who kissed Mary!"

In (2), the second speaker corrects the erroneous assertion by repackaging the information using word stress and syntax to highlight more clearly who did what to whom. Thus the choice of form follows communicative function.

Despite repeated calls for textbooks to include more information about how language works above the level of the sentence, most authors and publishing companies have been slow to incorporate the notion of discourse into their pedagogical materials. Such reluctance is understandable given the difficulties of describing grammar as "communicative practice" (Hanks 1996) in ways that are transparent to students and teachers. Authors can hardly be blamed for not wanting to open the Pandora's box of discourse with its competing concerns and approaches (see Schiffrin

1994 for an overview). For example, an author who wishes to give an explanation of a grammatical form in terms of discourse must decide what kind of contextual information to include: the illocutionary force of the utterance in which the form is embedded (speech act theory), the rules for turn-taking (conversation analysis), the expressive quality of the message (interactional sociolinguistics), the Gricean maxims at play (pragmatics), the power relationships manifest in the interaction (ethnography of speaking), and so on. If all these discourse-pragmatic notions, and many others, are potentially relevant to the understanding of a form-in-context, what is the textbook author to do? Suddenly, the teaching of grammar begins to resemble the teaching of culture, a subject notoriously difficult to delimit. Kramsch and Andersen (1999) describe the enlarged scope of grammatical analysis entailed by a discourse perspective:

> *From a discourse or anthropological perspective, linguistic structures, as they are used in communicative situations, are embedded in the whole social and historical context of culture (e.g., see Gumperz, 1982; Malinowski, 1923; Sapir, 1949); they are but one system of signs among many that people use to give meaning to their environment (p. 32).*

Rather than attempt to discuss the enormous diversity of phenomena encompassed by the discourse perspective, this chapter will focus on a set of linguistic forms called *pragmatically conditioned word-order constructions* as exemplified in (1), for example, dislocations, clefts, passives, and so on. I choose to focus on word order for two reasons. First, word order has been the object of much linguistic study, and, as a consequence, a solid body of descriptive research is readily available for the creation of pedagogical materials (Givón 1993; Lambrecht 1994). Second, word-order constructions are formal units, much like other grammar items found in textbooks. According to Rutherford (1987), traditional grammar instruction is predicated "on a solid, stable, fixed piece of the total language product—something with edges to it . . . in other words, a language construct" (p. 56).[2] Thus I see word-order constructions as a bridge between the sentential grammars embodied in today's textbooks and the more discourse-oriented grammars of the future. By demonstrating techniques for teaching word-order constructions, an important piece of discourse grammar, I hope to encourage textbook authors and publishing companies to begin exploring the implications of discourse for their pedagogical materials.

This chapter is divided into four main sections. In the first section, the obstacles to the teaching of the spoken language are discussed. In the second section, the ongoing grammar debate is put into historical perspective. It is argued that both the traditional, structural approach to grammar and the newer, comprehensible input approach are both inadequate for teaching grammar. A middle ground will be advocated; that is, pedagogical interventions embedded in primarily communicative activities. Following Long (1991), this middle ground is referred to as Focus on Form. In the third section, various pedagogical techniques for teaching word-order constructions will be discussed. These techniques come from three different sources: studies in Focus on Form methodology, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics. The fourth section will briefly explore the implications of discourse-oriented language teaching for TA training.

Obstacles to Teaching Oral Language

There have been a few, well-known attempts to link form and function in pedagogical materials, namely the functional/notional curriculum of Wilkins (1976) and of Breen and Candlin (1980), and the interaction-based programs of Kramsch (1981, 1983) and Bragger and Rice (1985). Yet these early attempts have had relatively little impact on how grammar is taught in today's classrooms and conceptualized in today's textbooks. Why is the grammar of speech still so foreign in foreign language programs? One of the major obstacles to the teaching of pragmatically conditioned word order, or any other "form" of the spoken language, lies in the evanescent nature of speech itself. Naturally occurring speech is fleeting, making it exceedingly difficult to represent accurately. In fact, an accurate transcription is often difficult for the uninitiated to read because of the multiple ellipses, interruptions, repairs, sentence fragments, and speech signals that have no conventional spelling. It is not uncommon for students learning the intricacies of transcription to "correct" recorded samples of speech unconsciously in order to make them conform to written norms. Ironically, such an unconscious grammatical cleansing ends up eliminating the very items that a discourse grammar purports to illuminate. While audio and video technology has allowed speech to be captured accurately and thus to be studied and taught in context (Altman 1989), relatively few foreign language materials make extensive use of authentic interaction; scripted dialogues and scripted videos still rule the day.[3] And therein lies much of the problem. If accurate transcription requires an apprenticeship, it should be obvious that scripted dialogues are often heavily influenced by written norms, resulting in much artificiality.

Lambrecht (1987) notes that artificiality in grammatical materials is not a recent phenomenon. He points out that grammars have relied on artificial, decontextualized sentences as far back as the classical times of Greece and Rome. As evidence of this, he cites the Latin grammarians' common practice of *oratio perfecta*, a practice that required the subject and object position of sentences to be filled with nouns in order to express a "complete" and thus more perfect thought. Sentences containing pronouns apparently seemed incomplete to Latin grammarians and were thus deemed inappropriate for grammatical analysis. Through the centuries, grammarians have rarely seemed to notice (or to care) that such sentences were virtually nonexistent in real spoken discourse (Ashby and Bentivoglio 1993). After two thousand years, it is understandable that the "fictional sentences" still prevalent in many grammar books no longer strike teachers as anomalous; educators have come to expect as much.

The gap between oral proficiency goals and the inadequate materials used to accomplish those goals has not gone unnoticed (Walz 1986). Since the advent of communicative language teaching and the oral proficiency movement, teachers and applied linguists have been questioning the legacy of the *oratio perfecta* tradition, that is, the preference for constructed examples based on the written language. After all, how is one supposed to teach the spoken language with materials that do not reliably reflect typical speech patterns? In fact, textbooks frequently fail even to mention or exemplify constructions that are prevalent in the spoken language. This is due, in part, to textbook authors' prescriptive attitudes toward language; oral norms of usage are generally marginalized or stigmatized vis-à-vis the written norms (Valdman 1992). The widespread bias against orality in higher education is nowhere more noticeable than in language departments where course content and pedagogical practices have traditionally been tied to the goals of literary studies. However, the lack of attention paid to oral grammar in pedagogical materials is not attributable only to the literary bias of the profession—ignorance plays an important role, too. Many teachers who have never taken classes in the related fields of sociolinguistics, pragmatics, or discourse studies are simply unaware of the patterns found in spoken discourse.

Given this state of affairs, it seems unlikely that grammar textbooks will radically change in the near future. Nevertheless, Kramsch and Andersen (1999) claim that multimedia technology is uniquely qualified to overcome many of the obstacles currently facing a pedagogical discourse grammar. The key to teaching language as communicative practice, they argue, is to capture real, interactional events and to turn them into multimedia "texts" that can be easily objectified, juxtaposed, annotated, explored, and manipulated by students. In other words, multimedia technology makes the textualization of oral language possible in a way that has never before existed, certainly not in the traditional textbook format, nor even in more recent video formats.[4]

> *The problem with learning a language from live context is that context itself cannot be learned, it can only be experienced, or apprenticed in. Therefore in order for context to be made learnable, especially in an academic setting, it has to be transformed into analyzable text. As an educational tool, multimedia technology opens up immense possibilities of contextualization by textualizing knowledge through its representational capabilities, that is, its endless reproducibility (Kramsch and Andersen 1999, p. 33).*

To make their notion of textualization more concrete, they describe an innovative CD-ROM for the teaching of Quechua, *Ucuchi: Quechua Live and in Color!* (Andersen 1987, 1996; Andersen and Daza 1994; Andersen et al. 1994). The CD-ROM is based on two hours of ethnographic video filmed on location in Bolivia. To understand a given scene, students have access to many sources of information: "spoken and written glosses and commentaries, transcriptions, translations, written ethnographies, and official documents, including interviews with the participants after the fact, not to mention the filmmaker, expert anthropologists and ethnographers" (Kramsch and Andersen 1999, p. 34). If pedagogical sentential grammars were largely made possible by the technology of the printing press, then perhaps the grammar of oral interaction will finally become possible thanks to the development of multimedia technology.

Communicative Language Teaching and Discourse Grammar

Celce-Murcia et al. (1997) claim that a significant shift in language teaching methodology has been occurring over the past decade and that communicative language teaching (CLT) is reaching a turning point. After its appearance in the early '70s and subsequent spread during the '80s, CLT began to encounter increasing criticism during the '90s. Much of the criticism centered on the insufficient and ineffective treatment of linguistic form in CLT. In 1990, Richards observed that the language teaching profession was divided into two camps favoring differing approaches to teaching oral language: the indirect camp versus the direct camp. Celcia-Murcia et al. (1997) describe CLT methodology as indirect: "The typical teaching practice for CLT in the late 1970s and the 1980s involves setting up and managing lifelike communicative situations in the language classroom (e.g., role plays, problem-solving tasks, or information-gap activities) and leading learners to acquire communicative skills incidentally by seeking situational meaning" (p. 141). Teachers who favored the direct approach (not to be confused with the direct method) never really adopted CLT's innovations, but instead remained faithful to the traditional structural syllabus and its related practices: First present new grammar explicitly, next practice grammar via drills, and finally have students produce the targeted grammar item in a quasi-communicative situation ("the three Ps"—Carter and McCarthy 1995, p. 155).

While the profession as a whole increasingly emphasized the role and importance of communication, teachers who were wedded to the traditional practices of direct grammar instruction simply adapted them to the teaching of conversation. In fact, Lee and VanPatten (1995) claim that for all the innovation associated with CLT, grammar instruction has changed very little in foreign language education. Blyth (1997) contends that "the presentation of grammar in foreign language textbooks and classrooms continues to be based on an outdated combination of behaviorism, structuralist linguistics, and versions of audiolingualism and cognitive-code theory" (p. 51). By the '90s, research was beginning to confirm what many of the traditionalists had feared all along: Entirely experiential and meaning-focused language learning resulted in less than perfect results. (Of course, so did traditional methods.) In particular, the studies on French immersion programs showed that despite years of meaningful input and opportunities for interaction, students still had not mastered many parts of French morphosyntax (Harley 1992; Harley and Swain 1984).

Rather than reject CLT and return to traditional grammar instruction, many researchers and practitioners began developing the outlines for a third kind of approach, a middle ground that seeks to focus learners' attention on forms within a meaningful context. This movement has come to be known as Focus on Form following an influential article by Long (1991). The central tenet of this middle ground is the belief that "making learners aware of structural regularities and formal properties of the target language will greatly increase the rate of language attainment" (Celce-Murcia et al. 1997, p. 146). Advocates of this new middle ground are quick to point out that it does not imply a return to traditional grammar instruction with its emphasis on sentential grammar. According to Dörnyei and Thurrell (1994), the major shifts that are occurring in language teaching today are threefold: (1) adding specific language input to communicative tasks, (2) raising learners' awareness of the organizational principles of language use within and beyond the sentence level, and (3) sequencing communicative tasks more systematically in accordance with a theory of discourse-level grammar. In a similar vein, Doughty and Williams (1998b) note that Focus on Form studies have expanded the definition of the term "form" beyond that of the "linguistic code features" that have been the traditional content of grammatical syllabi: ". . . It is important to see the term *form* in the broadest possible context, that is, that of all the levels and components of the complex system that is language" (p. 212).

Pedagogical Applications

Given the dearth of discourse-oriented foreign language materials, many teachers may wonder how it is possible to participate in the pedagogical and curricular shifts that Dornyei and Thurrell describe. How are teachers supposed to "raise learners' awareness of the organizational principles of language use beyond the sentence level" without materials that support such a goal? And how can teachers "sequence tasks more systematically in accordance with a theory of discourse-level grammar" if they have never been exposed to such a theory? It seems unrealistic to expect teachers to participate in such major shifts without a body of pedagogical materials that put these new ideas into practice. To that end, this section is devoted to the exemplification of various practices for teaching spoken grammar that may easily be incorporated into today's foreign language materials and programs. These techniques are rather eclectic since they derive from three separate, albeit related, sources: Focus on Form research, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics.

Applications from Focus on Form Research

The goal of this section will be to exemplify different activities and techniques that have received mention in the Focus on Form literature and to see how these activities might be adapted to the teaching of pragmatically conditioned structures. First, teachers must ask themselves whether discourse constructions are amenable to explicit instruction and, if so, to what kind of grammatical instruction. It is interesting that even among researchers who advocate the relevance of discourse grammar for language education, there is a certain skepticism about the "teachability" of such structures. In a cogent article on the application of discourse analysis to French language education, Barnes (1990) seems to question the efficacy of explicit instruction of these structures:

> Il est évident que l'usage de ces structures ne pourra pas s'apprendre par une approche structurale, c'est-à-dire, par une description formelle des structures accompagneé d'exercices du type transformationnel... Il me semble que l'acquisition de ces structures, ou plus exactement l'acquisition des intuitions des francophones sur leurs fonctions, se fait le mieux par une certaine expérience communicative. Cela veut dire qu'il faut que l'élève entende ces tournures dans des situations communicatives. Etant donné la difficulté de formuler des règles relativement simples sur l'emploi de ces structures, il semble plus approprié d'adopter une approche par "l'acquisition" que par "l'apprentissage" pour employer les termes de Krashen (p. 104).
>
> *It is obvious that the usage of these structures can't be learned by a structural approach, that is, by a formal description of the structures accompanied by transformational drills . . . It seems to me that the acquisition of these structures, or more precisely the acquisition of French-speakers' intuitions about their functions, is best accomplished by a certain communicative experience. This means that the student must listen to the structures in communicative situations. Given the difficulty of formulating relatively simple rules concerning the usage of these structures, it seems most appropriate to adopt an "acquisition" rather than a "learning" approach, to use Krashen's terms.*

While I agree with Barnes that students undoubtedly need lots of "communicative experience" before they can build up intuitions about pragmatic functions, I disagree with several of her assumptions. Barnes seems to assume that grammar instruction comes in only two varieties as described and promulgated by Krashen. The first variety is the traditional grammar-as-object approach that favors an explicit rule accompanied by decontextualized example sentences followed by mechanical production exercises. Since the rules that govern the selection of syntactic structures in oral discourse are difficult to state in simple terms, she reasonably assumes that these structures are not amenable to "explicit" instruction. The second approach that Barnes refers to largely spurns explicit grammar instruction as irrelevant to acquisition and emphasizes the importance of lots of comprehensible input. Fortunately, the dichotomous conception of grammar instruction illustrated in Barnes (1990) has increasingly given way to a middle ground called Focus on Form. This new approach combines elements from the other two approaches but is qualitatively different from either. In essence, Focus on Form activities attempt to create the ideal conditions for grammar learning, the "teachable moment" as it were, when the student has a communicative need that can be fulfilled only by a particular linguistic form, in other words, the moment when a form becomes communicatively salient. As such, Focus on Form activities differ crucially from traditional grammar exercises by their "prerequisite engagement in meaning before attention to linguistic features can be expected to be effective" (Doughty and Williams 1998a, p. 3).

How to focus a student's attention may be accomplished by a wide variety of innovative techniques. Doughty and Williams (1998b) note that one way to understand the differences between techniques is to place them "along a continuum reflecting the degree to which the focus on form interrupts the flow of communication, that is to say, on the basis of obtrusiveness" (p. 258). In obtrusive tasks, communication comes to a complete halt while the teacher focuses attention on the linguistic code in explicit ways. In unobtrusive tasks, linguistic code features are never mentioned explicitly. Rather, the grammar feature is carefully embedded in a communicative activity in such a way that the learner attends to the form while simultaneously attending to meaning. Following Doughty and Williams' (1998b) discussion of task obtrusiveness, five techniques will be presented here from the most to the least obtrusive: garden pathing, input processing, dictogloss, input enhancement, and task-essential language.

Table 1
Degree Obtrusiveness of Focus on Form Activities

	Obtrusive	◄────►	Unobtrusive
1. Garden Pathing	X		
2. Structured Input		X	
3. Dictogloss		X	
4. Input Enhancement			X
5. Task-Essential Language			X

Source: Adapted from Doughty and Williams (1998b, p. 258).

Garden Pathing

In this technique, the instructor purposefully leads students down the grammatical garden path with the goal of getting them to commit errors (Tomasello and Herron 1988). More precisely, this technique requires the instructor to present a grammatical pattern or rule in such a way that students overgeneralize the rule. The resulting errors are promptly corrected by the instructor. For example, the garden path technique could be used to help focus learners on the limits of productivity for the rule for deriving comparative adjectives in English: [adjective] + [er]. Students could be given a set of of adjectives from which to derive the comparative adjective by simply adding the comparative morpheme, for example, [-er]. After having firmly established the "rule," the instructor next presents an exceptional adjective, for example, *beautiful.* Invariably, the students will attempt to produce the comparative form using the same derivational rule as shown in (3):

(3)

fast	> faster
big	> bigger
tall	> taller
beautiful	>beautifuler*

---

*nongrammatical

The basic goal of garden pathing is to render the exceptions to a rule more salient thereby making them easier to learn. The technique can be used on any linguistic rule that is easy to overgeneralize, including syntactic-pragmatic rules. Katz (Forthcoming) describes extending the technique to teach the pragmatic differences between the French *c'est* cleft constructions[5] given in (4a) and (5a) and their so-called canonical counterparts in

(4b) and (5b):

(4)
a. C'est Vladimir Horowitz qui va jouer. (French cleft construction)
b. Vladimir Horowitz va jouer. (French canonical construction)
c. *Vladimir Horowitz is going to play.* (English canonical construction)

(5)
a. C'est le patron qui veut te parler. (French cleft construction)
b. Le patron veut te parler. (French canonical construction)
c. *The boss wants to speak to you.* (English canonical construction)

Katz points out that the pragmatic functions of these word-order constructions present particular difficulty for English speakers because both the French cleft constructions in (a) and the canonical constructions in (b) can be translated felicitously into English using only the English canonical structure (c). Katz claims that English speakers often fail to recognize the function of the French cleft construction because they erroneously assume, based on their L1, that the canonical construction is permitted in both contexts. Katz argues that negative evidence is thus required for English speakers to overcome the inevitable effects of transfer and overgeneralization: ". . . students need to know that it is not possible to use the French and English constructions in the same environments. It is doubtful that they will come to this conclusion through input alone."

Katz's contention is supported by data from Trévise (1986) which indicate that other kinds of discourse constructions are transferable from one language to another. To remedy this state of affairs, she proposes a translation exercise that leads students down the garden path. The exercise in (6) helps students discover that the canonical construction cannot be transferred to both contexts in French.

(6)
Translate the following pairs of questions and answers.
"How old are your parents?"
"My mother is 65 and my father is 67."
Correction translation: "Ma mère a 65 ans..."

"Where does your family come from?"
"My mother is from Paris and my father is from Montreal."
Correct translation: "Ma mère est de Paris..."

Where did your father buy the car?
My mother bought it.
Correct translation: "C'est ma mère qui l'a achetée."

Note that all the replies to the questions in (6) begin with the same noun phrase (My mother/Ma mère). Invariably, students fail to notice that the referent of the noun phrase "My mother" in the last response is not pragmatically equivalent to the same noun phrases found in the earlier responses. In the first two, the question itself evokes the referent in the mind of the listener by setting up a parent or family frame in which a mother would be given information. However, in the last question-and-answer pair, the reply corrects the assumption of the question, namely that the father bought the car. In such a communicative situation, French discourse prescribes a *c'est* cleft in order to highlight the unexpected or "new" information. In other words, the last question identifies the car as having been purchased but incorrectly identifies the father as the buyer. The *c'est* cleft construction is used to correct this faulty assumption.

In most garden pathing exercises, students are primed to make overgeneralizations by repeating the pattern several times as in the example with comparative adjectives. In the example of the French *c'est* cleft, little priming is needed since the students are likely to mistranslate solely on the basis of L1 transfer.

From these examples of garden pathing, it is clear that this technique can be highly obtrusive. In fact, many teachers may feel that such an exercise amounts to nothing more than teaching grammar through translation and therefore does not count as communicative or meaningful at all. Doughty and Williams (1998b, p. 240) point out that highly obtrusive tasks and techniques always run the risk of violating the fundamental principle of Focus on Form activities, that is, a prerequisite engagement in meaning, before the attention to linguistic features should occur. Thus the earlier translation exercise would need to be embedded into a communicative or meaningful context for it to count as a Focus on Form technique.

Structured Input

Another obtrusive technique is the structured input activity as described by Lee and VanPatten (1995) and VanPatten (1996). Based on studies of how learners derive meaning from input, VanPatten (1996) suggests that instruction be based on "structured input activities in which learners are given the opportunity to process form in the input in a 'controlled' situation so that better form-meaning connections might happen compared with what might happen in less controlled situations" (p. 60). "Structured input" is the centerpiece of "processing instruction," an approach to grammar instruction that advocates combining explicit explanations of grammatical rules with structured input and output activities. The main goal of this kind of grammar instruction is to "alter the processing strategies that learners take to the task of comprehension and to encourage them to make better form-meaning connections than they would if left to their own devices" (p. 60).

Processing instruction is distinguished from traditional approaches to grammar by an emphasis on input activities that precede all output activities. Lee and VanPatten (1995) criticize traditional grammar instruction for forcing students to produce before they have internalized any connection between the grammatical forms and their meanings:

> *While practice with output may help with fluency and accuracy in production, it is not "responsible" for getting the grammar into the learner's head to begin with. In short, traditional grammar instruction, which is intended to cause a change in the developing system, is akin to putting the cart before the horse when it comes to acquisition; the learner is asked to produce when the developing system has not yet had a chance to build up a representation of the language based on input data (1995, p. 95).*

To give students the chance to build up the necessary mental representations of grammar, Lee and VanPatten propose involving the student in a series of "structured input activities" that do not require the student to produce the targeted forms. Instead, these activities force the student to attend to the grammar within a meaningful context and to demonstrate comprehension in some nonlinguistic way. Since structured input activities are absent from most commercially produced foreign language textbooks, teachers must either learn how to develop their own or learn how to adapt their current textbook activities. To help teachers do this, Lee and VanPatten (1995) give specific guidelines for developing such activities:

a. Present one thing at a time.
b. Keep meaning in focus.
c. Move from sentence to connected discourse.
d. Use both oral and written input.
e. Have the learner "do something" with the input.
f. Keep the learner's processing strategies in mind.
(1995, p. 104)

It is important for beginning teachers to learn how to adapt commercially produced materials to suit the particular needs of their classrooms. Using the guidelines, TAs can learn how to create "structured input activities" from traditional production activities. For example, the recently published beginning French textbook *Chez Nous* (Valdman and Pons 1997) devotes an entire page to left dislocation as a grammatical feature.[6] While the explanation of this word-order construction and its function is admirably succinct and accessible, it is followed by several production exercises that oblige the student to begin producing left dislocations immediately. These production activities may be easily transformed into structured input activities. Compare the original activity given in (7) with its revised structured input counterpart in (8).

(7) Original Output Activity

Points de vue. Donnez un commentaire pour chaque sujet proposé.
modèle: L'union libre,....
>L'union libre, je pense que c'est une bonne idée.
ou L'union libre, c'est mieux acceptée aujourd'hui.

1. l'union libre
2. le mariage
3. les enfants
4. les femmes au foyer
5. les hommes au foyer
6. les pères absents
7. le divorce
8. la fidélité

Viewpoints. Make a comment for every proposed topic.
modèle: living together
>Living together, I think it's a good idea.
or Living together, it is more accepted today.

1. *living together*
2. *marriage*
3. *children*
4. *housewives*
5. *househusbands*
6. *deadbeat dads*
7. *divorce*
8. *monogamy*

(Valdman and Pons 1997, p. 347)

(8) Revised Version—Structured Input Activity

Points de vue. Indiquez si vous êtes d'accord ou pas avec les commentaires suivantes?

modèle: L'union libre, c'est assez acceptée aujourd'hui.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
1. L'union libre, c'est très pratique.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
2. Le mariage, c'est une institution dépassée.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
3. Les enfants, c'est trop de travail.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
4. Les femmes au foyer, c'est bien pour la famille.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
5. Les hommes au foyer, ce n'est pas l'ordre naturel.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
6. Les pères absents, c'est une honte.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
7. Le divorce, c'est un mal nécessaire.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
8. La fidélité, c'est impossible pour les hommes.	D'accord	Pas d'accord

***Viewpoints.** Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following comments.*

Model: Living together is fairly accepted today.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
1. Living together is very practical.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
2. Marriage is an outdated institution.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
3. Children are too much work.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
4. Housewives are good for the family.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
5. Househusbands violate the natural order.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
6. Absent fathers are a disgrace.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
7. Divorce is a necessary evil.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
8. Monogamy is impossible for men.	*Agree*	*Disagree*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers who have been trained in communicative methods tend to associate the term "input" with natural language. The input in processing instruction, however, is highly structured for specific purposes as is evident in (8). The most obvious differences between the original exercise in (7) and its revised version in (8) are the differing demands placed on the student. The original exercise requires the student to attend to form and meaning simultaneously while producing a brand new linguistic structure. By not requiring any production, the structured input activity lessens the load on the student's attentional resources. As a consequence, the chances of successfully focusing on both form and meaning are increased; the learner is better able to attend to both the left dislocated structure as well as the meaning of each comment. Of course, attending to form and meaning simultaneously is possible only if the vocabulary is relatively transparent and the sentences do not contain ambiguous or confounding grammar. This is what Lee and VanPatten (1995) mean when they remind teachers to keep the learner's processing strategies in mind when developing these activities. Note how the structured input activity eliminates distracting and extraneous detail by restricting the grammatical variation (a. "Present one thing at a time"). Note, too, how all the sentences repeat the same basic word-order pattern making them even easier to understand:

[topicalized noun phrase] +[c'est] + [predicate adjective/nominative].
[Le mariage] [c'est] [une institution dépassée]
[Marriage] [is] [an outdated institution]

Ideally, the structured input activity given in (8) should be followed by other input activities that require greater stretches of discourse (c. "Move from sentences to connected discourse"). The responses to structured input activities also lend themselves to follow-up output activities. For instance, survey responses can be compiled and briefly analyzed as a class activity or as pair work. Are there gender differences in the responses? What statements received the highest levels of agreement and/or disagreement? What statements were found to be patently absurd? Students could also be asked how they would contradict the statements with which they disagreed. Whenever a speaker makes a provocative assessment in a natural conversation, the interlocutor is typically obliged to express agreement or disagreement (Pomerantz 1984) as in (9):

(9)
Les enfants, c'est trop de travail.
->Oui, mais...c'est aussi un grand plaisir.
Children are too much work.
->Yes, but they're also a joy.

Le mariage, c'est une institution dépassée.
->Ah non, c'est toujours important! Difficile, peut-être, mais toujours important.
Marriage is an outdated institution.
->Oh no, it's still important. Difficult, maybe, but still important.

Dictogloss

A technique that is slightly less obtrusive than either structured input activities or garden pathing is the dictogloss. The dictogloss is a procedure that requires students to listen to a short text and then reconstruct the text as best they can. By requiring students to reproduce the text as faithfully as possible, students turn to each other to negotiate forms that they have not yet mastered. The main goal of the activity is metalinguistic: to oblige students to reflect on their own output so that they will come to know their areas of grammatical and pragmatic strength and weakness. Swain describes the procedure well:

> *. . . a short, dense text is read to the learners at normal speed; while it is being read, students jot down familiar words and phrases; then the learners work together in small groups to reconstruct the text from their shared resources; the final versions are analyzed and compared. The initial text, either an authentic or constructed one, is intended to provide practice in the use of particular grammatical constructions (1998, p. 70).*

The dictogloss is well suited for teaching discourse constructions because it includes both an oral and a written component that allows the teacher an opportunity to demonstrate how written norms of a language affect the perception of the oral language. The first step in preparing a dictogloss activity is to select a text. The oral text should include several examples of the targeted grammar item. If naturally occurring speech is unavailable, teachers can use commercially produced recordings, provided they are not too stilted. Consider the following recorded dialogue, taken from the beginning French textbook, *Parallèles: Communication et Culture* (Allen and Fouletier-Smith 1995). While it is constructed, the dialogue in (10) comes close to real spoken data in many ways, particularly in its use of left and right dislocated noun phrases (left and right dislocations are indicated by boldface).

(10)

Marchand: Et alors, ma petite dame, elles vous tentent, **mes tomates**? A 7 francs le kilo, c'est une bonne affaire!

Claudine: Hmmm....D'accord. Donnez-moi un kilo de tomates, s'il vous plaît.

Marchand: Très bien. Et avec ça?

Claudine: Eh bien...et deux laitues.

Marchand: Voilà. Ce sera tout?

Claudine: Oui, ce sera tout. Ça fait combien?

Marchand: Alors, **les tomates**, ça fait 7 francs. Et puis, **deux laitues à 3 francs 50**, ça fait 7 francs. Bon, ça nous fait 14 francs. Oh là là! c'est pas possible, **ça, un billet de 500 francs**! Vous n'avez pas la monnaie?

Marchand: So, ma'am, my tomatoes look pretty tempting to you? At 7 francs per kilo, they're a bargain.

Claudine: Hmmm...OK, give me one kilo, please.

Marchand: All right. And what else?

Claudine: Ahh...two heads of lettuce.

Marchand: There you go. Will that be all?

Claudine: Yes, that's it. How much is that?

Marchand: Well, the tomatoes come to 7 francs. And two lettuces at 3 francs 50 each comes to 7 francs. OK, that makes 14 francs. Oh no! I can't handle that, a 500 franc bill. Don't you have anything smaller?

(Allen and Fouletier-Smith 1995, p. 204, adapted from the original)

Before the students listen to the dialogue, the teacher should quickly review the form and function of dislocations in spoken language (for a good example of an explanation of dislocation accessible for beginning language students, see Valdman and Pons 1997, p. 346). Swain (1998) comments that the goal of this form-focused minilesson is to "heighten students' awareness about an aspect of language that would be useful to them in carrying out the dictogloss" (p. 73). In other words, the lesson need not include much in the way of a traditional grammatical explanation. Presumably, for this reason, Doughty and Williams (1998b) find it less obtrusive than garden pathing and input processing, which typically include explicit rules. If students are aware of a grammatical item, it is believed that they will be able to perceive it more easily in speech and, consequently, that they will talk about it during groupwork. During the minilesson, the teacher may wish to review vocabulary items that students are not likely to know. After the minilesson, the teacher reads the dialogue or plays the audio recording several times. The first time, the students do nothing more than listen. The second time, however, students should be encouraged to take notes. Next, the students work in groups to reconstruct the text from their notes. When they have finished, a group of students is selected to compare their reconstructed text with the original text. The comparison can be facilitated by using an overhead projector; the teacher would need to make a transparency of the original text before class, and the students would need to write their reconstruction on a transparency as well.

Swain (1997) argues that based on her study and others, there is growing evidence that the dictogloss procedure helps students notice the "gap" between what they want to say in the target language and what they know how to say. Swain hypothesizes that noticing this gap will trigger a search for solutions *if the conditions are right*. She claims that research indicates that teachers can improve the conditions for successful metalinguistic analysis by carefully attending to three things: (1) selection of text (some texts seem to elicit more metatalk than others), (2) preparation of students for all aspects of the task so that they understand what they should do and why, and (3) correction of the final product. Concerning the last point, Swain notes that collaborative metatalk occasionally results in students positing erroneous hypotheses. It is up to the teacher to monitor the metatalk as much as possible and to correct any faulty hypotheses concerning the targeted grammar item.

Input Enhancement

Input enhancement refers to the various ways features of the linguistic code may be made more perceptually salient. As a technique, it is not particularly obtrusive because it neither requires nor implies any explicit grammatical explanation. A common form of input enhancement is the use of typographical conventions (italics, boldface, underlining, etc.) in a passage to highlight vocabulary words. A good example of this technique can be found in White (1997), a recent study on the effects of typographical input enhancement on the acquisition of French possessive adjectives. While typographical conventions are probably the most widespread kind of input enhancement, there are other techniques commonly used as well. For example, teachers often "double code" a linguistic feature in speech by drawing attention to it with iconic hand signals and other paralinguistic cues, for example, pointing backwards to index pastness when using a past tense morpheme ("She went on vacation"), pointing up to indicate maximum degree when using superlative constructions ("He is the tallest"), pointing to oneself to highlight reflexivity ("I talk to myself"), and so on.

Teachers looking for ways to enhance discourse constructions and any other spoken phenomena could benefit enormously from learning more about transcription practices (Edwards and Lampert 1993). In a very real sense, the most sophisticated examples of "input enhancement" are transcripts produced by discourse analysts who use complex representational systems for indicating features of talk-in-interaction: pitch, rhythm, turn taking, overlapping, interruptions, and so on. Edwards (1993) contends that because transcription plays such a central role in the study of spoken language, discourse analysts must be very aware of the impact transcription principles and conventions have on interpretation: ". . . choices made concerning . . . how to organize and display the information in a written and spatial medium can all affect the impressions the researcher derives from the data" (p. 3). Although Edwards' remarks are intended for discourse researchers, they are equally pertinent for textbook authors interested in the effects of various input enhancements in their pedagogical materials. As White (1997) points out, more research is needed to determine the effects of different visual enhancement options. Of course, transcription principles and typographical conventions are only a beginning. The growing field of multimedia holds much promise for exploring the pedagogical and research implications of input enhancement. The multiple combinations of sound, text, and image permit the learner to attend to characteristics of the input in ways that were unimaginable only a few years ago (Chapelle 1998).

Task-essential Language

One of the most unobtrusive ways for getting students to focus on form within a meaningful context is to involve students in a communicative task that obliges them to either produce or comprehend the form. Long and Crookes (1992) argue that tasks provide one of the most pedagogically sound vehicles "for the presentation of appropriate target language samples for learners—input which they will inevitably reshape via applications of general cognitive processing capacities—and for the delivery of comprehension and production opportunities of negotiable difficulty" (p. 43). The literature on task-based language teaching includes both real-world tasks encountered in everyday experience and pedagogical tasks designed for the classroom. Whatever the task—real-world or pedagogical—the overriding focus should be on meaning. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to devise a "natural" task that requires the production of a specific grammar item for its successful completion. In their discussion of the inherent difficulties of task-based methods, Loschky and Bley-Vroman identify three degrees of linguistic involvement in a task: naturalness, utility, and essentialness:

> *In task-naturalness, a grammatical construction may arise naturally during the performance of a particular task, but the task can often be performed perfectly well, even quite easily, without it. In the case of task-utility, it is possible to complete a task without the structure, but with the structure, the task becomes easier. The most extreme demand a task can place on a structure is essentialness: The task cannot be successfully performed unless the structure is used (1993, p. 132).*

Task essentialness is even more elusive when it comes to dealing with the grammar of spoken discourse. While discourse constructions such as dislocations correlate with specific pragmatic functions, it remains arguable whether they can be considered obligatory or essential in specific contexts. Simply put, the choice of discourse constructions is probabilistic and never absolutely clear-cut, although the usage patterns in most corpora are easy to demonstrate statistically (Ashby and Bentivoglio 1993).

Katz (Forthcoming) demonstrates a clever activity for eliciting cleft constructions. Noting that French *c'est* clefts are primarily used to serve a contrastive function, that is, to highlight a piece of information in opposition to another piece of information, Katz develops a referential communication task based on contradicting misinformation as in (11).

(11)

T'as vu ça?! Marie, elle a embrassé Jean! (Did you see that?! *Mary kissed John.*)

> Mais non, **c'est Jean** qui a embrassé Marie! (*No, it was John who kissed Mary.*)

Referential communication is essentially the exchange of information between two speakers. Yule (1997) notes that the information exchanged in these kinds of communicative acts implicates the grammar of reference "whereby entities (human or nonhuman) are identified (by naming or describing)" (p. 1). To set up conditions favorable for eliciting such clefts, Katz has her students watch a short video clip of a movie. After viewing, she discusses the clip with her students, but in so doing, she makes several referential mistakes. In other words, she creates multiple "opportunities" within a communicative context for students to use the cleft construction by introducing a communicative problem. Yule (1997) gives several principles for designing "problematicity" into a communicative task such as the incorrect identification of a referent. In one such task, students are given what appears to be the same scene or map as the basis for some kind of decision-making task. It turns out that the scenes or maps are slightly different, thus creating a "referential mismatch" that leads to contradiction.

Applications from Discourse Analysis

While the Focus on Form techniques detailed in the last section derive from classroom-based research on second-language acquisition, the pedagogical applications in this section derive from discourse analysis, a branch of descriptive linguistics. McCarthy (1991) points out that "discourse analysis is *not* a method for teaching languages; it is a way of describing and understanding how language is used" (p. 2, original emphasis). Nevertheless, many applied linguists have advocated adapting the tools and techniques of discourse analysis for pedagogical purposes (Carter and McCarthy 1995; Celce-Murcia 1990; Hatch 1992; Kramsch 1981, 1984; Riggenbach, 1990). The proponents of integrating discourse analysis into the foreign language curriculum differ as to how it should be done, but they all seem to agree that making students responsible for collecting and analyzing linguistic data would help raise linguistic awareness. In a nutshell, the goal is to change the role of the student into that of a language researcher who works to discover patterns and induce rules from authentic data. Riggenbach (1990) outlines several activities that require the student to observe and record native-speaker speech. In all of these activities, the communicative event (e.g., an interview, a conversation, a narrative) is not the pedagogical end in itself as is normally the case with classroom communicative activities. Rather, Riggenbach advocates that communicative activities be used as means to an altogether different end—to generate data in the form of audio recordings that are subsequently transcribed and studied. For beginning students who are unable to elicit and transcribe authentic speech, Riggenbach suggests the use of news broadcasts or other sources of authentic speech such as documentaries or talk shows.

Aimed at language teachers and language-acquisition researchers, Hatch (1992) does not offer specific activities for teaching discourse to language students. Rather, the goal of her book is to teach language professionals, including language teachers, how to do discourse analysis. Hatch does claim that the same activities she has developed for the benefit of language educators can be adapted for the classroom: "This book will not tell you 'how to teach discourse' to language learners. Nevertheless, if you believe that language learners are, in the best sense of the term, 'language researchers,' you will find that many of the practice activities can be used with language learners to heighten their awareness of the system behind discourse." Similarly, Carter and McCarthy (1995) offer no specific exercises for integrating discourse grammar into the language classroom. Instead, they outline a general pedagogical approach to guide teachers:

> *Our mnemonic would be the "three Is" (Illustration—Interaction—Induction): where illustration stands for looking at real data—which may be the only option since the grammar books and current materials so often fall short; interaction stands for discussion, sharing of opinions and observations; and induction stands for making one's own, or the learning group's, rule for a particular feature, a rule which will be refined and honed as more and more data is encountered . . . One only needs an initial curiosity, some real data, and the feeling that there is a lot to be discovered to get started (1995, p. 155).*

While general pronouncements may be enough encouragement for some teachers to give discourse analysis a try, the majority undoubtedly need concrete exercises to get them started, especially since most teachers have so little training in the field. Fortunately, there are a few manuals that offer pedagogical exercises adapted for the college language classroom (McCarthy 1991; McCarthy and Carter 1994). These introductory texts on the "pedagogy of discourse" supply teachers with a wealth of exercises based on spoken and written discourse covering a full range of discourse topics: speech acts, rhetorical analysis, coherence relations, deixis, discourse syntax, discourse prosody, discourse and culture, and so on. Moreover, these books also include helpful annotations to all exercises. These notes often give insightful hints about what discourse patterns to look for in the data and what problems students may have apprehending the patterns. Unfortunately, both books are written for ESL teachers and exemplify discourse phenomena with English (mainly British) texts. Nevertheless, both books are excellent sources for foreign language teachers looking for ideas about how to develop discourse-oriented grammar activities.

An excellent resource for the French and German instructor interested in discourse analysis is Kramsch (1981, 1984). These manuals not only give a theoretical argument for teaching communicative practices in the foreign language classroom, but they also supply an abundance of interesting activities that develop skills for managing conversations. Kramsch (1981) also includes transcriptions of authentic German and French conversations with annotations pointing out various discourse strategies (topic initiation, floor taking, topic redirection, polite interruption, etc.).

In order to help students discover how word order constructions are employed in discourse, McCarthy (1991) proposes that teachers begin by using pragmatically odd written texts. It may be advisable to use English texts initially, even in the foreign language class, in order to help students grasp the pragmatic concepts more easily. Beginning and intermediate foreign language students lack the pragmatic intuitions necessary to analyze pragmatic anomaly in target language texts. Once the concept of pragmatic anomaly is established, students can begin to explore texts in the target language. First, students read an anomalous text (aloud, if possible). Next, they must explain as precisely as possible where the problem arises, that is, why the text sounds so odd. McCarthy claims that students do not need to know any special metalanguage in order to analyze the pragmatic anomalies in (12) and (13).

(12)

Q: What time did you leave the building?
A: What I did at five-thirty was leave the building.
(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)

(13)
Dear Joan,
Me, I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big lawn surrounded by trees and it's a flower bed that is in the middle of the lawn. When it was full of daffodils and tulips was in the spring. Here you'd love it. It's you who must come and stay sometime; what we've got is plenty of room.
Love, Sally
(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)

When helping students analyze these texts, it is important for teachers to point out that the text's oddity is not due to "grammar errors" since all the sentences are grammatically correct. In other words, teachers need to make clear at this stage of analysis that non-nativelike texts may be constructed from grammatical or nativelike sentences, or, put differently, grammaticality does not assure good communication. From this simple fact, students become aware that communicative competence entails much more than grammatical competence (Canale and Swain 1980). In (12), the reply is pragmatically odd because the given information—leaving the building—is foregrounded by the cleft construction rather than the new information—five-thirty—which is presented as though it were presupposed. The text of (13) is recognizable as a letter or postcard, but one that violates many pragmatic constraints. As McCarthy (1991) explains, "it sounds as if the postcard writer is answering questions nobody has actually ever asked such as 'Isn't it a pond that's in the middle of the lawn?' 'No, it's a flower bed that's . . .'; or else implicit contrasts are being suggested without any apparent motivation: 'here you'd love it,' as opposed to 'somewhere where you might hate it' " (p. 53). Once the students have sufficiently analyzed what structures are problematic and given reasons for their oddity, they must then rewrite the text to make it sound more natural. McCarthy gives an example of a rewritten postcard in (14):

(14)
Dear Joan,
I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. A big lawn surrounded by trees is outside my window and a flower bed is in the middle of the lawn. It was full of daffodils and tulips in the spring. You'd love it here. You must come and stay sometime; we've got plenty of room.
Love, Sally
(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)

While the rewritten version is hardly elegant, the pragmatic oddity is gone. In the final step of the exercise, students compare the two versions and posit hypotheses about the pragmatic constraints on the distribution of certain word-order constructions. These hypotheses can be tested and refined on other sets of similarly odd-sounding texts. It is at this final stage of hypothesis-formulation that the teacher should introduce the metalanguage of discourse grammar to help students name the phenomena that they have just "discovered," for example, cleft constructions, dislocations, and so on.

Once students have realized that the distribution of certain syntactic structures is governed by principles of interaction, they are ready to analyze discourse "staging," the process of assigning relative importance to any bit of information within discourse. The metaphor of staging is meant to capture how speakers arrange the parts of a discourse for certain rhetorical effects (Brown and Yule 1983; Grimes 1975). Brown and Yule (1983) emphasize that every text, spoken or written, complex or simple, is built in the same linear fashion—one word after another. The linearity of communication coupled with the speaker's need to assign relative prominence to all information results in various predictable discourse patterns. Some of the most striking patterns involve the ways speakers introduce new information into a discourse, such as the introduction of a new character into an oral narrative. Similar to the actors of a play who enter a scene, move around the stage, and then depart, most complex oral narratives contain multiple participants who enter and exit the storyworld.

To be an effective communicator in speech or in writing, it is crucial to consider the audience. And just like directors or playwrights who must always consider the play from the audience's vantage point, speakers must be aware of the listener. Is the listener paying attention when a new topic is introduced into the conversation? Speakers who wish their listeners to attend to new information will typically place it "front and center" in what discourse analysts refer to as the "topic" or "theme" slot, the discursive equivalent to the stage's foreground. It is quite common in unplanned discourse for speakers to use left dislocations as a way to focus the listener's attention on a new participant who will become the topic of subsequent talk. Givón (1993) notes that the need for keeping track of multiple participants in discourse, what he calls "the grammar of referential coherence," invariably centers on the pragmatic use of word order.

Givón (1993) gives several simple techniques for examining the dynamics of discourse reference and topicality. According to Givón, topicality is conceived of as a gradable property of nominal participants (nouns and pronouns) within discourse. In other words, nouns and pronouns can be considered more or less "topical" depending on their relative importance to the overall discourse. Givón explains that different constructions code different levels of topicality as well as perform different pragmatic functions. One simple way for students to discover the correlations between sentence constructions, pragmatic functions, and topicality of nominal referents is to list every noun or pronoun used by the speaker to index the same referent. For example, in (15) the letter writer refers to other parties in different ways, or in the jargon of discourse analysts, "codes" the third-person referents using different devices:

> (15)
> Dear Abby,
> There's (a) **this guy** I've been going with for near three years. Well, the problem is that (b) **he** hits me. (c) **He** started last year. (d) **He** has done it only four or five times, but each time it was worse than before. Every time (e) **he** hits me it was because (f) **he** thought I was flirting (I wasn't). Last time (g) **he** accused me of coming on to (h) **a friend** of (i) **his**. First, (j) **he** called me a lot of names, then (k) **he** punched me . . .
> Black and blue
> (Givón 1993, p. 206)

Here is the list of referring devices for third-person referents in the order in which they appear in (15):

a. this guy
b. he
c. He
d. He
e. he
f. he
g. he
h. a friend
i. his
j. he
k. he

What is there to say about such a simple list? What patterns could there possibly be? Students will probably feel hesitant since the data seem too simple, too intuitive to require any analysis. The first observation that students are likely to make is that pronouns greatly outnumber nouns in this list. The second observation is that all referring devices except (h) refer to the same person, the abusive boyfriend. After stating the obvious, most students are likely to lapse into silence. At this point, students should be led to look at discourse reference from a functional perspective by a series of questions: Why did the writer choose a full noun phrase in (a) and a pronoun rather than a noun in (b)? What is the difference between the two noun phrases (a) and (h)? Which referent (a or h) is the "topic" of the letter? Students should be helped to state a hypothesis along these lines: Pronouns are used to talk about the topic of conversation whereas nouns are used to refer to things that aren't the topic but that may become the topic in later talk.

Another simple technique that is particularly effective for demonstrating the pragmatic functions of topic-coding devices such as dislocations and pronouns is called "referential lookback" or "referential distance." In this exercise, students must count the number of clauses between the appearance of a noun phrase and its closest antecedent. Nouns in right dislocations typically code referents with antecedents found in the immediately preceding clause, whereas nouns found in left dislocations tend to have a greater "referential distance." In other words, to find the antecedent of left dislocated nouns, students must search through many more clauses than is the case with right dislocated nouns (Givón 1993, p. 211). When the statistical pattern is uncovered, students must posit a plausible hypothesis to explain the phenomenon. To do so, students should be encouraged to see how left and right dislocations are used by speakers for interactional purposes. Duranti and Ochs (1979) were the first analysts to highlight how speakers use left dislocations as tools to manage the system of conversational turn taking. They pointed out that any speaker who wishes to change the topic of conversation must first fight to gain the floor. They also noted that speakers often gain the right to speak by repeating a topic, typically a noun phrase, until the other speaker or speakers cede the floor ("My boyfriend . . . my boyfriend . . . my boyfriend, he got a new job.") Thus students can be led to see the correlation between new topics (i.e., referents without antecedents) and the left dislocation construction.

The major drawback to most of the techniques discussed in this section is that they go well beyond the expertise of the vast majority of foreign language teachers who have little if any formal training in discourse analysis. Teachers are likely to agree with Barnes (1990) who objects that this kind of linguistic analysis will unduly complicate language study for most students, especially for beginning language students. Such discourse analytic techniques risk introducing more metalinguistic terminology than ever before into the language classroom with traditional terms simply exchanged for new ones: "topicality," "presupposition," "referentiality," and so on. It would seem wise then to consider most of these techniques more appropriate for more advanced levels of language study, such as a fifth-semester composition or conversation class as suggested by Valdman (1997).

Another problem with such techniques that Barnes (1990) points out is the difficulty students are likely to have formulating simple rules for complex discourse phenomena. Teachers interested in exploring the application of discourse analytic techniques need to remind themselves that language awareness develops with lots of practice and exposure to authentic input. Moreover, cognitive skills, such as inducing patterns from data and building testable hypotheses, requires much practice, too. Only after considerable time will students begin to understand how to do discourse analysis, that is, how to draw nuanced inferences about the correlation of form and function in discourse from seemingly insignificant texts.

Applications from Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics shares many of the same goals as discourse analysis but differs primarily in its methods of analysis. As its name implies, corpus linguistics refers to the analysis of large databases of real language examples stored on a computer (Biber et al. 1998; McEnery and Wilson 1996; Sinclair 1991; Thomas and Short 1996). While most corpus linguists do not have a pedagogical orientation, the field has nonetheless given rise to applications for language learning. One of the most recent and most promising pedagogical applications is called Data-Driven Learning (DDL). DDL relies on inductive methods of grammatical analysis made possible by large and easy-to-manipulate databases of authentic language called linguistic corpora (also referred to as corpuses):

> *What distinguishes the DDL approach is the attempt to cut out the middleman as far as possible and to give direct access to the data so*

> *that the learner can take part in building up his or her own profiles of meaning and use. The assumption that underlies this approach is that effective language learning is itself a form of linguistic research, and that the concordance printout offers a unique resource for the stimulation of inductive learning strategies—in particular the strategies of perceiving similarities and differences and of hypothesis formation and testing (Johns 1994, p. 297).*

The impetus for introducing corpus data into the classroom grew out of the dissatisfaction with artificial examples found in language textbooks. Johns argues not only that artificial examples are of dubious value for teaching language function, but that they generally are less interesting than the real thing. Furthermore, he questions the use of "simplified texts" because they run the risk of destroying the very features that account for the choice of one form over another in the first place. In general, those calling for the use of corpora in language education have argued that the study of form and function "entails a far more extensive use of authentic, unmodified data than has been traditional in language teaching" (Johns 1994, p. 294).

Induction in grammar instruction is not a particularly new idea. Inductive methods based on corpora and concordances, however, is an innovation. Hadley (1996) recounts an anecdote that illustrates the potential of a corpus printout to teach form-function correlations: "In Japan, language learners still memorize sentences such as 'The food was eaten by me.' . . . Instead of trying to explain to learners why it is odd simply from insight, we can direct our students to look at tangible examples from the corpus. Using the corpora/concordancer package, they find that *eaten* does in fact collocate most commonly with the word *food*." According to Hadley, his Japanese ESL learners were provided with the following language samples taken from COBUILD's Bank of English as shown in (16):

(16)
. . . and a wide selection of **food** will be **eaten**. Prepared Softbill **food** is a good st . . .
. . . inger foods and any **food** that can be **eaten** seductively are in! Accomplished fl . . .
. . . an excellent **food** and should be **eaten** in plentiful quantities. Now to make . . .

. . . test with an extract of a commonly **eaten food**, we are likely to provoke a pos . . .

. . . asing the amount and variety of **food eaten**. Problems could include failure to e . . .

. . . ition to the amount and type of **food eaten**, the frequency of meals may be an im . . .

. . . ollowing: Reduce the amount of **food eaten**, but not by sacrificing nutritious f . . .

. . . and the kids. No charge except for the **food eaten**. Big fuss made of birthday child.

. . . Another reason why hot **food** gets **eaten** in hot countries is that chillies an . . .

. . . bused by overeating it. If a **food** is **eaten** in any form once in three days, or m . . .

An enormous corpus, the Bank of English includes hundreds of millions of words taken from books, radio and television broadcasts, newspapers, and spoken English (informal and formal registers). In (16), the concordancer program has searched the database for collocations of [eaten+food], extracted them from their discourse content, and displayed them separately in a Key Word In Context (KWIC) format. These examples can be printed out and made into a classroom handout. Most concordance programs allow the user to control the amount of contextualization desired—anywhere from an item in its immediate context as shown in (16) to an item embedded in a paragraph. After examining the examples in (16), students understand the anomaly of such artificial sentences as "The sandwich was eaten by me." In real language, the agent of the passive form of the verb "to eat" is almost always omitted because it is either irrelevant or understood or both.

Johns (1994) categorizes DDL methods as either reactive or proactive. The reactive use of a corpus is always in response to a query or a learning problem that arises during teaching. Johns gives the example of a student who asked him one day for the difference between *therefore* and *hence*. Proactive uses, on the other hand, refer to materials or lessons that have been created by teachers who preselect and arrange data to aid induction. To teach about article selection, a central element of discourse grammar, Johns uses corpus data arranged by a concordance as shown in (17). The goal of the handout is to help students discover the tricky semantic/pragmatic restrictions on the choice of definite article versus zero article in

English. The first part of the handout presents contrasting examples of definite and zero article from which students induce the rule(s) governing article selection. In the second part of the handout, students fill in the blanks with the correct article.[7]

(17)

Definite Article	Zero Article
1. In Gwynedd, a bedrock of **the Welsh language**, there are 25 film-making companies.	1. The research also showed increases in the frequency of bad **language** and sex on TV.
2. We must accept that the salvation of **the French language** involves learning one or more of the languages in neighbouring countries.	2. Inspectors said behaviour was generally good, but features "such as free use of **language** and nonattendance at lessons are tolerated much more than in conventional schools.

1. . . . proud of their command of _____ English language and engage in quite of lot of patting . . .
2. . . . but it does not mean that _____ everyday language is bad: it is simply the way of thin . . .
3. . . . that cerebral dominance for _____ language is established before the age of five.
4. . . . is one thing and _____ technical language is another, Vocabulary is words, lists of . . .
5. . . . Slavic speakers. Orthodoxy and _____ Greek language remain the two markers of . . .
6. . . . up an emaciated child, and in _____ sign language asked me to vaccinate the baby.
7. . . . of a computer system for _____ Chinese language. In another move, Computer Applications . . .
8. . . . the splendid hope that _____ scientific language could provide a model for cultural discourse . . .
9. . . . writers attempted to free _____ poetic language from the prevailing romantic imitations . . .
10. . . . phoneticized version of _____ Tsimshian language. To someone such as I, who had the . . .
11. . . . be able to understand _____ natural language. The truth is that is a much more...

12. ...was French. "Le own goal" entered _____ language. New Scientist, in an article by...

Language teachers interested in incorporating DDL techniques into their curriculum face a major obstacle—finding a computerized corpus in the target language. Unfortunately, access remains a problem since corpora are still largely the reserve of researchers. Nevertheless, there are ways of getting around such formidable obstacles. Tribble (1997) offers several helpful "quick-and-dirty" ways for developing corpora for language teaching. He suggests that commercially available CD-ROM encyclopedias constitute more than enough electronic data for most successful applications of DDL techniques. Furthermore, many CD-ROM materials have built-in search functions that may be used like concordance programs.

Another idea that has gone relatively unexplored is the use of the World Wide Web as a corpus; after all, it is by far the world's largest electronic database of searchable text in most of the major languages. Based on the same principles as a concordancer searching a corpus, an Internet search engine may be used to find thousands (sometimes millions!) of examples of grammatical structures embedded in authentic target language texts (Blyth 1999, p. 116). And similar to a concordancer, many search engines will even display the search results with the embedded key word or phrase in boldface. At the University of Illinois' Division of English as an International Language (DEIL), an innovative website called "Grammar Safari" has been developed to show teachers and students how to transform the Internet into an enormous grammar database.[8] The rationale is explained on the web site's homepage:

> *Grammar books tend to make things fairly simple and there is some value in that. Nevertheless, for the serious student of English, it's worthwhile also to broaden your horizons and explore the jungle out in the real world. The World Wide Web (WWW) is an excellent place to begin experiencing English as it occurs in its natural surroundings—not only are there millions of English texts readily available, but also most of them can be electronically searched for those elusive yet fascinating English grammar structures.*

The basic concept is applicable to any language that is available on the Internet. Instead of using content words for key words, learners or teachers use the foreign language grammatical words to locate examples of target language structures. Using the Spanish version of the popular search engine Yahoo!, I conducted a search using the Spanish phrase "todo lo que" ("all that") A small sample of the results are given in (18).

(18)
CARABANCHEL - Esta es la pagina de Carabanchel donde encontraras arte, cultura, ocio, musica y **todo lo que** quieras saber sobre nuestro barrio
<http://www.carabanchel.com/>

Prólogo al alumno - En la Academia de Peluquería Michi podés encontrar **todo lo que** necesitás para formarte como peinador.
<http://www.michi.adad.net/alumno.html>

QTPD.com - QTPD.com tu sitio de entretenimiento venezolano en la red, con **todo lo que** querías, chat, postales, amor, humor, y mucho mucho más.
<http://www.qtpd.com/>

As useful as Web pages may be for providing thousands of grammatical examples, it is important to remember that they are written texts and may not be particularly useful for exemplifying spoken constructions. On the other hand, because of the enormous size of the Internet and because of the informality of discourse in cyberspace, even the most typical oral expressions are liable to turn up. As proof, consider a small sample of the results from a Yahoo! search that I conducted for the French expression "et patati et patata" ("and so on and so on"), a phrase usually restricted to informal speech, given in (19). The first text is strikingly paratactic in nature and rife with indexes of informal spoken French: discourse markers (Allons bon [OK]), left dislocated topics (la culture, c'est...[culture, it's...]), omission of obligatory complementizer "que" (je sais ø la culture... [I think ø culture]).

(19)
J'ai oublié ma confiture - CULTURE Allons bon, Cyrille qui fait une page sur la culture, c'est à
hurler de rire. Oui, je sais, la culture c'est comme la confiture moins on en a **et patati et patata**.
C'est vrai, ce n'est peut être pas la page qui va s'enrichir le plus. A moins.
<http://www.mygale.org/00/udt1138/jaioubli.htm>

232

> Chant choral - Le Courrier du Choeur - Belgique Le jeu de rôle du chef de choeur Les pouvoirs de la polyphonie (César Geoffray) Un bon chef pense à son successeur L'humour de Gustave (A Coeur Joie Belgique) **Et patati, et patata**.. Le bavardage dans nos chorales Le moine et l'habit -
> <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/Michel_Lion/ccho>

Although the vast range of data in electronic form available via the Internet is impressive, the fact remains that corpora of transcribed spoken language are hard to come by. Teachers committed to teaching spoken syntax should give serious thought to creating their own materials. This is not as impossible as it may seem. First of all, a corpus need not be overwhelmingly large. A ten-minute sample from a recorded, naturally occurring conversation will produce enough data to exemplify many of the most common discourse structures—repairs, dislocations, discourse markers. Moreover, recorded conversations or interviews do not need to be transcribed in their entirety. Teachers should transcribe only those sections that contain pertinent grammar items. While these materials are not as onerous to produce as teachers may think, they still take time and effort. Ultimately, publishing companies should consider providing samples of recorded authentic oral discourse with transcriptions along with traditional materials, that is, studio recorded scripted dialogues. Even a small corpus of short interactions would greatly help an instructor trying to teach grammar as communicative practice.

As with the applications from discourse analysis, the pedagogical applications of corpus linguistics appear rather limited for several reasons. First, searching databases and inducing patterns from large sets of data require a level of linguistic sophistication well beyond most beginning and intermediate students. Most reports of the applications of DDL have been on advanced learners who already possessed a rather sophisticated knowledge of grammar and lexis. It remains to be seen how DDL may be adapted for beginning levels. Second, students and teachers not proficient with concordance software may find that such techniques require too much time spent learning a new computer program rather than learning the target language. And third, logistical problems such as access to computerized corpora loom large. Therefore rather than letting beginning and intermediate students discover form/function correlations on their own, teachers may find it more profitable and efficient to use a corpus to produce their own handouts as suggested.

TA Education

A recent survey of graduate TAs in French departments around the country discovered that TAs lacked important metalinguistic knowledge despite a strong emphasis on grammatical analysis throughout their own language learning experience (Fox 1993). In particular, Fox's survey revealed that the model of language with which TAs begin their careers ignores discourse competence as a distinct level of grammatical organization. As a result, TAs are prone to conceive of grammar as comprised of distinct entities that are adequately described at a sentential level. To fill the knowledge gap, Fox suggests that TAs receive an introduction to linguistic description of the target language as part of their curriculum to raise their awareness about discourse grammar. Besides gaining greater awareness of discourse competence and discourse grammar, TAs need to become more aware of the vast differences between the written and spoken languages and how those differences are often masked or distorted in the classroom.

One of the best ways to discover the particularities of spoken language is to transcribe it. TAs can benefit immensely by transcribing a short stretch (five minutes is usually sufficient) of any naturally occurring conversation as part of their methods course. TAs can transcribe the same stretch of dialogue and then compare their transcriptions in class, or they may prefer to work on different interactions. TAs may also benefit from conducting with native speakers interviews that they can later transcribe. These transcriptions not only provide the TAs with a better awareness of the complexities of spoken language, but may also serve as potential materials to be used in language classes. The recordings and transcriptions may even be collected and used to start a departmental corpus of spoken language.

In keeping with a constructivist approach to TA education, the role of the TA educator is not so much to teach teachers how to teach discourse syntax, but rather to facilitate and guide TAs' own construction of teaching practices (Blyth 1997). The goal is not so much to "train" the new TA in a set of pedagogical practices that he or she must import into the classroom as it is to help the apprentice teacher raise questions about the instruction of language from a discourse perspective. If beginning teachers are to be convinced of the importance of the teaching of discourse grammar using the pedagogical practices discussed here (Focus on Form activities, discourse analytic techniques, and corpus linguistics), they must first experience these new practices as a learner would. By experiencing these practices during a methods class, TAs not only gain greater awareness about discourse, but they also come to understand what the practice feels like from the learner's perspective. There is only so much, however, that any methods instructor should expect to accomplish in a single methods course. Even though a constructivist approach will help TAs to understand a discourse-oriented approach to foreign language teaching, it is crucial that TAs have materials that support such an approach if they are to be successful in the classroom.

Conclusion

In the past decade, discourse-oriented linguists have made much progress in their description of noncanonical grammatical forms encountered in authentic contexts, for example, clefts, dislocations, agentless passives, and so on. The importance of such descriptions for language teaching has not been lost on applied linguists. As Sinclair (1991) puts it: "There are signs of a growing recognition that the comprehensive study of language must be based on textual evidence. One does not study all of botany by making artificial flowers" (p. 6). Sinclair is right. There is no reason that students of language should be restricted to studying artificial sentences, especially not today. Thanks to the growing fields of discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, today's teachers have better descriptions than ever before of the patterns of spoken language. The question for language educators is no longer *whether* we should teach language as discourse, but *how*.

Some foreign language scholars have expressed reasonable doubt about the "teachability" of word-order constructions and other discourse phenomena (Barnes 1990). It was argued that this doubt stems from a traditional concept of grammar instruction. After years of neglect, pedagogical grammar has recently come to the forefront again in the foreign language teaching profession. Fortunately, this renewed interest does not indicate another alarming swing of the pendulum but rather a reasonable attempt to integrate the goals of grammatical accuracy and communicative fluency. The Focus on Form activities described in this chapter have all been developed with those double imperatives in mind—to improve accuracy and to improve fluency—in a manner consonant with current research in second language acquisition. The Focus on Form methods for teaching word-order constructions all meet (to a greater or lesser degree) the central tenet of this approach: A prerequisite engagement in meaning is established before a focus on linguistic form is attempted.

The same can not be said for the techniques derived from discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. That is not to say that these techniques do not have their place. Rather, these techniques are aimed more at establishing a sophisticated awareness of how discourse is organized than at improving communicative fluency. While they hardly constitute a program for teaching discourse grammar by themselves, they could readily be integrated into the teaching of more advanced levels of language where textual analysis is already commonplace. Valdman (1997) claims that envisioning language as discourse may prove useful in rethinking many of our pedagogical practices, including curriculum development and course articulation. He argues that the artificial but widespread division between conversation and composition courses could be partially eliminated by putting discourse grammar at the core of the intermediate language curriculum. He also states that a focus on discourse grammar in the intermediate and advanced courses might provide relief from the ad nauseam review of sentential grammar structures presented in the beginning courses.

While most of the activities and techniques described in this chapter are new and relatively untested, there is no reason to assume that they should not be as effective for teaching discourse grammar as they are for teaching sentential grammar: "[A]lthough there is, as yet, little evidence of the efficacy of attention to the form of language at the discourse and pragmatic levels, we believe that the principle will still apply" (Doughty and Williams 1998b, p. 212). As promising as the techniques in this chapter may be, they are virtually nonexistent in today's pedagogical materials. It is hoped that future foreign language textbook authors will incorporate these ideas into their materials. Without such textbooks, it is highly unrealistic to expect that TAs (or seasoned teachers for that matter) will be very successful at teaching discourse grammar. TAs would greatly benefit from a teacher's edition of a textbook that included background information about how the foreign language is organized at the discourse level. And spoken, recorded texts of naturally occurring interaction should be included in textbooks to illustrate more accurately the various discourse structures to be learned. All of this needs to be integrated into a fully articulated, discourse-oriented program, preferably aimed at the intermediate level in order to help our students move from producing sentences to producing discourse.

Notes

1. I would like to acknowledge my apprecation to Kevin Lemoine and three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this chapter.
2. The term *construction* is based on the notion developed in Construction Grammar (Fillmore 1991; Fillmore and Kay 1995; Fillmore, Kay, and O'Connor 1988; Goldberg 1995; Jackendoff 1997; Lambrecht 1994; Lambrecht and Lemoine 1996; Michaelis and Lambrecht 1996). In this approach to grammar, a *construction* is the basic unit of grammatical form. Essentially, a construction is any structure with a conventional mapping of form with semantic structure and pragmatic function. Fillmore and Kay (1995) describe a *construction* as a "structured set of conditions determining a class of actual constructs of a language" (p. 4). Thus, a construction can be lexical, morphological, or, like the examples considered in this article, syntactic.
3. *Portes Ouvertes* (Haggstrom et al. 1998) is a recent example of a first-year foreign language program that makes liberal use of authentic, unscripted video.
4. Altman (1989) cites video's qualities of *maximum contextualization* and *maximum control* as the reason the medium is particularly "well suited to display the connections between language and the real world upon which comprehension depends" (p. 8). While maximum contextualization remains analog video's claim to fame, the medium can no longer be said to afford maximum control. That honor now goes to multimedia software in which digitized files may be randomly accessed at the click of a computer key.
5. In a cleft sentence the copula (the conjugated form of "to be") is preceded by "it" in English and "c'est" in French and followed by a noun phrase and a relative clause, for example, *It is Horowitz who is going to play. C'est Horowitz qui va jouer.*

6. The term *left dislocation* used here refers to a specific word-order construction in which an extraclausal pronoun or noun is placed immediately to the left of the clause, for example, [Mary], John kissed her.

7. This exercise and many more DDL materials are available online at Tim Johns' Virtual DDL Website <http://sun1.bham.ac.uk/johnstf/def_art.htm>.

8. The Grammar Safari web site's address is <http://deil.lang.uiuc.edu/web.pages/grammarsafari.html>.

Works Cited

Allen, W., and N. Fouletier-Smith. 1995. *Parallèles: Communication et culture.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Altman, R. 1989. *The Video Connection: Integrating Video into Language Teaching.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Andersen, R. W. 1987. *The Real McCoy: A Model for an Authentic Text-based Language Curriculum.* Unpublished report, UCLA, Department of TESL/Applied Linguistics.

_______. 1996. *The Sociocultural Content of a Discourse-centered Multimedia Language Curriculum.* Unpublished manuscript, UCLA, Department of TESL/Applied Linguistics.

Andersen, R. W., and J. L. Daza. 1994. *Ucuchi: Quechua Live and in Color!* CD-ROM. Los Angeles: UCLA, Authentic Discourse Research and Development Project.

Andersen, R. W., J. L. Daza, and R. E. Robison. 1994. Learning Quechua Language and Culture from Interactive Videodisc. In *Language in the Andes,* edited by P. Cole, G. Hermon, and M. Daniel, 379–400. Newark, DE: Latin American Studies Program, University of Delaware.

Ashby, W., and P. Bentivoglio. 1993. Preferred Argument Structure in Spoken French and Spanish. *Language Variation and Change* 5: 61–76.

Barnes, B. 1990. Apports de l'analyse du discours à l'enseignement de la langue. *The French Review* 64 (1): 95–107.

Biber, D., S. Conrad, and R. Reppen. 1998. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language, Structure, and Use.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Blyth, C. 1997. A Constructivist Approach to Grammar: Teaching Teachers to Teach Aspect. *Modern Language Journal* 81: 50–66.

______. 1999. *Untangling The Web: Nonce's Guide to Language and Culture on the Internet.* New York: Nonce Publishing.

Bragger, J., and D. Rice. 1985. *Du Tac Au Tac: Managing Conversations in French.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Breen, M., and C. Candlin. 1980. The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 1: 89–112.

Brown, G., and G. Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., and M. Swain. 1980. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1: 1–47.

Carter, R., and M. McCarthy. 1995. Grammar and the Spoken Language. *Applied Linguistics* 16: 141–159.

Celce-Murcia, M. 1990. Discourse Analysis and Grammar Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11: 135–151.

Celce-Murcia, M., Z. Dörnyei, and S. Thurrell. 1997. Direct Approaches in L2 Instruction: A Turning Point in Communicative Language Teaching? *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (1): 141–152.

Chappelle, C. 1998. Multimedia CALL: Lessons to Be Learned From Research on Instructed SLA. *Language Learning and Technology* 2 (1): 22–34. <http://polyglot.cal.msu.edu/llt/vol2num1/article1/index.html>

Cooremen, A., and K. Kilborn. 1990. Functionalist Linguistics: Discourse Structure and Language Processing in Second Language Acquisition. In *Crosscurrents in Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theories,* edited by T. Huebner and C. Ferguson, 195–224. Amsterdam and Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z., and S. Thurrell. 1994. Teaching Conversational Skills Intensively: Course Content and Rationale. *ELT Journal* 48: 40–49.

Doughty, C., and J. Williams, eds. 1998a. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., and J. Williams. 1998b. Pedagogical Choices in Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 197–261. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A., and E. Ochs. 1979. Left Dislocation in Italian Conversation. In *Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press.

Edwards, J. 1993. Principles and Contrasting Systems of Discourse Transcription. In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, edited by J. Edwards and M. Lampert, 3–32. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Edwards, J., and M. Lampert, eds. 1993. *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fillmore, C. J. 1991. *On Grammatical Constructions.* Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

Fillmore, C. J., and P. Kay. 1995. *Construction Grammar.* Unpublished manuscript, Stanford, CA, CSLI Publications.

Fillmore, C. J., P. Kay, and M. C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions: The Case of 'Let alone.' *Language* 64 (3): 501–538.

Fox, C. 1993. Communicative Competence and Beliefs about Language among Graduate Teaching Assistants in French. *Modern Language Journal* 77: 313–324.

Garrett, N. 1986. The Problem with Grammar: What Kind Can the Language Learner Use? *Modern Language Journal* 70: 133–148.

Givón, T. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function-Based Introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grimes, J. 1975. *The Thread of Discourse.* The Hague: Mouton.

Gumperz, J. J., ed. 1982. *Discourse and Social Identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hadley, G. 1996. Sensing the Winds of Change: An Introduction to Data-Driven Learning. <http://sun1bham.ac.uk/honstg/winds.htm>

Haggstrom, M., J. Frommer, C. M. Jones, M-F. Bunting, and L. Patenotte. 1998. *Portes Ouvertes: An Interactive Multimedia Approach to First-year French.* Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Hanks, W. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practices.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Harley, B. 1992. Patterns of Second Language Development in French Immersion. *Journal of French Language Studies* 2: 245–260.

Harley, B., and M. Swain. 1984. The Interlanguage of Immersion Students and Its Implications for Second Language Teaching. In *Interlanguage,* edited by A. Davies, C. Criper, and A. Howett, 291–311. Edinburgh, Scot.: Edinburgh University Press.

Hatch, E. 1992. *Discourse and Language Education.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Herschensohn, J. 1988. Linguistic Accuracy and Textbook Grammars: The Determiner System in French. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 409–414.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. Twistin' the Night Away. *Language* 73 (3): 534–559.

Johns, T. 1994. From Printout to Handout: Grammar and Vocabulary Teaching in the Context of Data-Driven Learning. In *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar,* edited by T. Odlin, 293–313. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Katz, S. Forthcoming. A Functional Approach to the French *C'est* Cleft. *The French Review.*

Kramsch, C. 1981. *Discourse Analysis and Second Language Teaching.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

______. 1983. Discourse Function and Grammar Rules: Topic Construction in German. *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1): 13–21.

______. 1984. *Interaction et discours dans la classe de langue.* Paris: Hatier-Crédif.

Kramsch, C., and R. Andersen. 1999. Teaching Text and Context Through Multimedia. *Language Learning & Technology* 2 (2): 31–42.<http://polyglot.cal.msu.edu/llt/vol2num2/article1/index.html>

Lambrecht, K. 1987. On the Status of SVO Sentences in French Discourse. In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse,* edited by R. Tomlin, 217–261. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

______. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lambrecht, K., and K. Lemoine. 1996. Vers une grammaire des compléments zéro en français parlé. *Absence de marque et représentation de l'absence: Travaux du CerLiCO.-9.* Rennes, France: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Lee, J., and B. VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Long, M. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective,* edited by K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch, 39–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M., and G. Crookes. 1992. Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design. *TESOL Quarterly* 26: 27–56.

Loschky, L., and R. Bley-Vroman. 1993. Grammar and Task-based Methodology. In *Tasks and Language Learning,* edited by B. Crookes and S. Gass, 123-167. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Malinowski, B. 1923. The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. In *The Meaning of Meaning,* edited by C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, New York: Harcourt Brace.

McEnery, T., and A. Wilson. 1996. *Corpus Linguistics.* Edinburgh, Scot.: Edinburgh University Press.

McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M., and R. Carter. 1994. *Language As Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching.* London and New York: Longman.

Michaelis, L., and K. Lambrecht. 1996. Toward a Construction-based Theory of Language Function: The Case of Nominal Extraposition. *Language* 72 (2): 215–247.

Pomerantz, A. 1984. Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes. In *The Structures of Social Action,* edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. 1990. *The Language Teaching Matrix.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Riggenbach, H. 1990. Discourse Analysis and Spoken Language Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11: 152–163.

Rutherford, W. 1987. *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.* New York: Longman.

Sapir, E. 1949. The Selected Writings of Edward Sapir. In *Language, Culture, and Personality*, edited by D. G. Mandelbaum. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. 1998. Focus on Form through Conscious Reflection. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 64–82. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J., and M. Short, eds. 1996. *Using Corpora for Language Research: Studies in the Honour of Geoffrey Leech.* London and New York: Longman.

Tomasello, M., and C. Herron. 1988. Down the Garden Path: Inducing and Correcting Overgeneralisation Errors in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 9: 237–246.

Tomlin, R. 1994. Functional Grammars, Pedagogical Grammars, and Communicative Language Teaching. In *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*, edited by T. Odlin, 140–178. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Trévise, A. 1986. Is it Transferable, Topicalization? *In Crosslinguistic Influence in L2 Acquisition*, edited by E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Tribble, C. 1997. Improvising Corpora for ELT: Quick and Dirty Ways of Developing Corpora for Language Teaching. <http://sun1.bham.ac.uk/johnstf/biblio.htm>

Valdman, A. 1992. Authenticity, Variation, and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom. In *Text and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*, edited by C. Kramsch and S. McConnell-Ginet, pp. 79–97. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

______. 1997. Letter from the President. *AATF National Bulletin* 23 (1): 1.

Valdman, A., and Pons, C. 1997. *Chez Nous: Branché Sur le Monde Francophone.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

VanPatten, B. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction in Second Language Acquisition.* Norword, NJ: Ablex.

Walz, J. 1986. Is Oral Proficiency Possible with Today's French Textbooks? *Modern Language Journal* 70: 13–20.

White, J. 1997. Getting the Learners' Attention: A Typographical Input Enhancement Study. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 85–138. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, D. A. 1976. *Notional Syllabuses.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. 1997. *Referential Communication Tasks.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

THE EFFECT OF EXPLICIT TRAINING ON SUCCESSFUL CIRCUMLOCUTION: A CLASSROOM STUDY

Mary Ellen Scullen
University of Maryland, College Park

Sarah Jourdain
SUNY Stony Brook

Introduction

The ability to circumlocute is one of the crucial strategies that has been identified as a means of compensating for imperfect mastery of a foreign language. As such, it is included in the ACTFL speaking proficiency guidelines as a measure of pragmatic competence (Buck, Byrnes, and Thompson 1989). However, it is a skill that is rarely taught and even more rarely mastered in the foreign language classroom (Berry-Bravo 1993). Indeed, the tacit assumption has often been that the skills of pragmatic competence are best acquired in the target language environment (Freed 1995).

According to a recent small-scale study (Scullen and Jourdain 1997), it appears that this assumption needs to be reexamined. Students who participated in a month-long work exchange in France showed little gain in their ability to circumlocute after their time abroad. This suggests that acquiring competence in circumlocution demands more than a brief stay abroad and naturally raises the question: Do students receiving explicit classroom instruction in circumlocution strategies fare any better than those who briefly study abroad? Data from this study, carried out in the spring of 1998, indicate that all students who received either practice alone or training and practice made significant gains over the course of the semester in "successful" circumlocution (discussed later).

In this paper, we will describe the classroom study we conducted, focusing on the training and practice we gave students in the skills of circumlocution. One of our goals in this study was to link classroom activities devoted to enhancing pragmatic competence to the linguistic forms that are most frequently called upon to carry out those functions. For instance, in the task of circumlocution, one often finds the need to use generic, or superordinate, terms such as "thing" or "tool" coupled with a relative clause. Imagine how a pitchfork might be described if one could not remember the term for this tool.

- "It's a thing that looks like a gigantic fork."
- "It's a tool that my grandfather used on his farm."

By associating certain lexical items, such as generic terms, and certain linguistic forms, such as relative clauses, to a particular pragmatic function, circumlocution, we were able to create a context in which students could engage in meaningful communication which, by its very nature, elicited the use of particular forms. Indeed, this sort of "information-based" activity is ideal for "giving learners a purpose for using their developing language abilities" (Lee and VanPatten 1995, p. 167). We would agree that coupling linguistic forms with their communicative functions is a necessary association and one that allows instructors to re-create meaningful discourse in the classroom.

The Study

Participants and Setup

Our purpose in conducting this study was to test whether the explicit teaching of circumlocution skills would result in greater abilities to circumlocute. Two sections of fourth-semester French students, ranging in ability from approximately novice-high to intermediate-high on the ACTFL proficiency scale, participated in this semester-long study. Both sections were taught by the same instructor (one of the researchers) and met for three hours each week during a fifteen-week semester. Both the experimental group and the control group of students received identical pretests, three identical practice sessions, and identical posttests. The experimental group received, in addition, explicit training on the specifics of four different strategies for successful circumlocution (superordinate terms, analogy, function, and description). Explicit training for the experimental group (described later) occurred immediately prior to each practice session. Training on the use of superordinate terms occurred prior to training session 1, analogy prior to session 2, and function and description prior to session 3.

The elicitation procedure we used followed Yule and Tarone (1990). Students were paired, with one student playing the role of a telephone receptionist (Role A) and the other student playing the role of a person ordering something by telephone from a catalogue (Role B). Both students had packets that consisted of pages containing illustrations of various objects belonging to a related semantic or functional group (for example, a page of objects used on a camping trip: lantern, canteen, thermos, grill; a page of various musical instruments; a page of different types of housing). For students acting out Role B, one object on each page of their packets was indicated by a large arrow. The student needed to order (and hence describe) that item to his or her partner who was looking at an identical sheet that contained no indication of which object was selected. It was the task of the listener to circle the appropriate object once he or she had understood what was being ordered/described. To restrict the amount of help the listener could offer, these students were given a fixed set of expressions to use either to elicit more information or to signal that they had understood or not understood. They were specifically instructed to use only these expressions and not to say anything else.

Instructions for Role A (Telephone Receptionist)

Bonjour Monsieur/Madame. Je vous écoute.
"Hello, Sir/Madam. I'm listening."

Je ne comprends pas.
"I don't understand."

Pourriez-vous être plus précis(e)?
"Could you be more specific, please?"

D'accord je vois.
"Okay, I see."

Autre chose pour vous, Monsieur/Madame?
"Would you like anything else Sir/Madam?"

Although some students felt constrained by this lack of expression, it was necessary to impose such a restriction in order to place the burden of explaining (or demonstrating strategic competence) on the speaker. While Yule and Tarone (1990) did not permit their listeners to provide any verbal feedback whatsoever, we felt that in order to establish a more natural communicative situation, some feedback should be possible, particularly feedback as to whether the listener understood the description. Limits were established, however, in order to ensure that the linguistically stronger of the two students would not dominate the interaction. This sort of restriction on the type of negotiation of meaning that could take place was crucial to the design of the study so that we could adequately tally and compare changes in ability to circumlocute over time for each individual participant.

Students playing Role B were also provided with some useful vocabulary and instructed that they would need to "do most of the talking."

Instructions for Role B (Client)

Bonjour Monsieur/Madame.
"Hello, Sir/Madam."

Je voudrais commander...
"I would like to order . . ."

Vous voyez?
"Do you see?"

All students were given the opportunity to play both roles. In the pretest, the students switched roles after describing four objects. In the posttest each student described and/or identified eight objects before switching roles. Students were advised before the activity began that they would be switching roles halfway through. The cue to switch roles was that the next page in their packet contained the instructions for the role they had not yet played.

In the pretest, half of the students in each class (Group A) were asked to order a decorative bed pillow, an oil lantern, a pair of dice, and a stapler. The other half (Group B) ordered a rocking chair, a thermos, a chess pawn, and a Rolodex. For the posttest, the students described the items from the pretest in addition to row houses, a zither (a type of musical instrument), a corkscrew, and a pitchfork for Group A. Group B students also described a house on stilts, a balalaika (a type of guitar), a pasta maker, and a hedge trimmer. These items were chosen as objects for which intermediate students most likely had no specific lexical forms in the target language.

During the pretest and posttest, each pair of students was tape-recorded. The recordings were subsequently transcribed, coded, and analyzed with regard to the variety and number of circumlocution strategies used by the students. In addition, the pictures circled by the listener were compared to the item to be described by the speaker in order to determine whether the student placing an order had successfully transmitted his or her message to the listener.

Students used a variety of strategies to compensate for their lack of lexical knowledge. Adapting the taxonomies of Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Liskin-Gasparro (1996), Paribakht (1985), and Yule and Tarone (1990), we classified these strategies as either L1-based strategies or L2-based strategies and coded them accordingly in the transcripts.[1] L1-based strategies include *Foreignizing*, taking an L1 word and pronouncing it as if it were an L2 word, and *Language Switch*, the insertion of a word or phrase in a language other than the target language with no effort to accommodate that word to the target language phonology /morphology.

L2 strategies include *Semantic Continuity* or the use of terms that are in some way related to the meaning of the target item, for example, the use of superordinate terms, synonyms, and analogy. L2 strategies also include various types of *Description* or terms that serve to describe all or part of the target item. Examples of description would include traits such as size, shape, number, color, function, location, material, and style.

Results

Definition of "Successful" Circumlocution

A successful interaction was defined as one in which the student taking the orders circled the object the speaker had been asked to order. The results illustrated in Table 1 indicate the rate of successful recognition of the object described for the experimental and control groups. It can be seen from these results that both groups made progress in their ability to circumlocute during the course of the study. In the case of both the experimental and the control groups, that progress was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$ on paired t-tests).

Table 1
Rates of Successful Circumlocution

	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental Group (N = 17)	73.5%	91.2%
Control Group (N = 8)	68.8%	81.2%

In addition, the experimental group appears to have been somewhat more successful in circumlocuting than the control group at the time of the posttest. This difference in rate of improvement does not reach the level of statistical significance, however ($p = 0.15$ on a Mann-Whitney Rank Sum comparison of posttest scores).[2] The small number of students participating in this study and their unequal distribution between the experimental and the control groups (17 students versus 8 students, respectively) compromise the ability to make comparisons between the groups. Although there is a 15 percent likelihood that the observed difference in rate of improvement is due to chance, we nevertheless view these data as indicative of the possibility that specific training in the skills of circumlocution may lead to improved rates of success.

We further note that successful circumlocution depends on both the speaker and the listener. For example, what appears to be a successful instance of circumlocution does not always result in comprehension on the part of the listener. Likewise there are cases that appear devoid of any evidence of successful circumlocution where the listener nevertheless manages to identify the correct object.

Consider the following interchange between two speakers, CK and MR, in which CK attempts to describe a pair of dice located on a page of pictures that in addition contains a backgammon board and a set of playing cards.

CK: Alors... uh... (??) la première chose ah.... il y a deux de ces choses, ils sont... utilisés par uh... uh... ils ont des numéros um... codés avec des points que les numéros un à six et il y a deux de ces choses... et... ce sont utilis[e]... pour un jeu.... Tu... tu dépenses dans la main, oui? Tu comprends? non?

MR: Je ne comprends pas.

CK: (laughs) um ai ai ai, oh là là,... (long pause) il a six côtes [kot] ils sont six côtes, non? Six côtes um... uh... ai ai ai... il y a deux de ces choses et les deux sont le même chose (speaking slowly and enunciating) un ressemble [rəzābl] l'autre, oui? comprends? Et chaque chose, chaque chose a... les numéros un, deux, trois, quatre, cinq et six, et tu les utilis[e] ensemble uh... les choses choisissent un numéro entre deux à douze et... ces sont utilis[e] pour jouer un jeux... ils sont très petites... et uh...

MR: D'accord je vois, je vois je pense.

CK: Tu vois enfin?

MR: Je pense.

CK: J'espère... ça doit être très facile.

CK: So . . . uh . . . (??) the first thing ah . . . . there are two of these things, they are . . . used by uh . . . uh . . . they have numbers um . . . coded with dots that the numbers one to six and there are two of these things . . . and . . . they are used . . . for a game. . . . You . . . you "spend" in the hand, yes? You understand? No?

MR: I don't understand.

CK: (laughs) um ai ai ai oh là là, . . . (long pause) there are six sides there are six sides, no? Six sides um . . . uh . . . ai ai ai . . . there are two of these things and the two are the same thing (speaking slowly and enunciating) one resembles the other, yes? understand? And each thing, each thing has . . . the numbers, one, two, three, four, five and six and you use them together uh . . . the things chose a number between two and twelve and . . . they are used to play a game . . . they are very small . . . and uh . . .

MR: OK, I see, I see, I think.

CK: You see finally?

MR: I think.

CK: I hope so . . . this should be very easy.

This appears to be an example of successful circumlocution given the presence of a number of appropriate L2 strategies and the relative clarity of the language. For example, CK includes description of number: *il y a deux de ces choses* (there are two of these things); size: *ils sont très petites* (they are very small); constituent features: *ils ont des numéros um... codés avec des* *points* (they have numbers um . . . coded with dots); function: *ce sont utilis[e] pour un jeu* (they are used for a game); and even a few examples of extended description: *tu dépenses dans la main* (you "spend" in the hand) and *les deux sont le même chose* (the two are the same thing). Yet the listener, MR, did not circle the dice but rather indicated that the speaker was describing a seven of hearts!

In a similar vein, it is hard to imagine how the following instance of circumlocution was successful, for there does not seem to be enough information for someone to identify correctly the object being described, in this case a camping lantern (pictured on a page with other camping equipment such as a thermos, a cooler, a camping knife, and so forth, although there was no other "light source" present on the page):

MB: Pour camping... tu... pour camping tu... il y a très chaud.

JB: Répétez.

MB: Très chaud, très um... pou... dans le soleil... un faire camping le soleil n'est pas la.

JB: D'accord.

MB: For camping . . . you . . . for camping you . . . there is very hot.

JB: Repeat.

MB: Very hot, very um . . . for . . . in the sun . . . one to go camping the sun is not there.

JB: OK.

Yet, this is counted as a successful instance of circumlocution because the listener correctly identified the lantern as the object being described.

Both situations described point to the difficulty in determining whether a specific act of circumlocution is successful. In the first case, the speaker was not successful, despite the use of several different circumlocution strategies. As Savignon (1997) points out in her discussion of communicative competence, successful communication crucially depends on the "negotiation of meaning" between a speaker and a listener. Although, by design, negotiation of meaning was limited in this study, listeners were nevertheless allowed to indicate their lack of understanding and to signal to their partners the need for further clarification. Perhaps the particular act of circumlocution illustrated was unsuccessful due to the speaker's failure to take the listener's needs (in this case, linguistic proficiency) into account. Likewise, the second example is a striking example of an impoverished message between two students with a low degree of linguistic proficiency. Yet, somehow in their almost pidgin utterances, the meaning is communicated from the speaker to the listener; hence, the circumlocution is successful. One might also speculate that students (such as these two) with limited proficiency in the L2 rely to a greater extent on the visual clues provided by the images to convey their meaning. The importance of recognizing the listener's needs is highlighted by the following comment made by a student in the experimental group after the study: "It helped me when my partner tried different ways of describing the object *when she saw I wasn't understanding*" (emphasis ours).

Training for Success in Circumlocution

The examples and discussion in the previous section lead quite naturally to the following question: Can successful circumlocution be objectively described so that those characteristics of successful circumlocution can be taught? Based on a previous small-scale study of the difference in circumlocution abilities in students before and after a month-long stay in France on a work-exchange program, we identified several characteristics of successful circumlocution (Scullen and Jourdain 1997). In particular, students who were good at circumlocution used the following L2 strategies: superordinate terms, analogy, function, and description. The following examples from the 1997 study illustrate two relatively brief but successful instances of circumlocution. It should be noted that in contrast to the study (reported in this article) involving pairs of students, students here described an object to one of the researchers. An utterance was judged as a successful instance of circumlocution when both the researcher conducting the interviews and the researcher listening to the audiotapes could easily identify the object being described.

In the first example, the student is describing a bridle bit on a horse, which is indicated on a picture of a horse's head complete with reins, bridle, and so on. In the following examples, the circumlocution strategy being used is indicated by the highlighted term in parentheses.[3]

SH: Oui... c'est une euh... c'est une chose (**superordinate**) euh... qui ressemble [rəzābl] à un cercle (**shape/analogy**)... qui tient les...

les rennes (**function**). Je pense que c'est le mot... um... et c'est[] à côté de... du nez ou de la bouche (**location**).... C'est[] en métal (**material**).

SJ: Je vois 3 possibilités.

SH: Oui... c'est le plus grand (size).

SH: Yes . . . it's a uh . . . it's a thing (**superordinate**) uh . . . which looks like a circle (**shape/analogy**) . . . which holds the the reins (**function**). I think that's the word. um . . . and it is next to . . . the nose or the mouth (**location**). . . . it is metal (**material**)

SJ: I see three possibilities.

SH: Yes . . . it's the biggest one (size).

In the next example, the student is describing a kitchen timer, pictured on a page with other kitchen utensils including an hourglass-like egg timer filled with sand.

SH: C'est une sorte de de réveil (**analogy/synonym**)... um on utilise quand on prépare le la cuisine (**function**)... um... on tourne uh une petite chose (**extended description**)... pour euh compter les les minutes (**function**)... il n'y a pas de sable (**negative description**).

SH: It is a type of alarm (**analogy/synonym**) . . . um one uses when cooking (**function**) . . . um . . . one turns uh a little thing (**extended description**) . . . to uh count the the minutes (**function**) . . . there is no sand (**negative description**).

Based on these examples of successful circumlocution as well as consideration of what topics and strategies would fit logically within the curriculum of a fourth semester French course, we decided to train the experimental group on the following strategies, including use of the following: superordinate terms, analogy, functional description, and more traditional description (including things such as size, color, style, material). Further description and examples of each training category follow.

Training in Superordinate Terms

In the very first practice session, students in the experimental group were taught about the use of specific superordinate terms to aid them in the description of items for which they did not know the appropriate lexical term. Students were asked to brainstorm about possible superordinate or generic terms for a rocking chair and a lounge chair. Additionally, the instructor presented both general superordinates such as *une chose* (thing), *un truc, un machin* (thing-a-ma-jig), as well as more specific terms such as *un appareil* (apparatus), *un bijou* (piece of jewelry), *un meuble* (piece of furniture), *un vêtement* (piece of clothing), and *une machine* (machine). The use of superordinate terms was further reinforced during the course of the semester through several vocabulary building exercises (such as the one that follows) in which students were asked to provide a generic term for a specific group of objects.

> C'est logique! Trouvez le terme générique qui englobe les objets cités à chaque ligne.
>
> *Modèle:* un diamant, un saphir, une émeraude, un rubis = *des pierres précieuses*
>
> 1. une poupée, un ours en peluche, un clown, un yoyo =
> 2. une bague, des boucles d'oreilles, une alliance, un bracelet, un collier =
> 3. Noël, le Jour de l'An, la Saint-Nicolas, la fête du Travail =
>
> (Joiner, Duménil, and Day 1994, p. 69)
>
> That's logical! Find the generic term that describes the objects in each line.
>
> *Model:* a diamond, a sapphire, an emerald, a ruby = *precious stones*
>
> 1. a doll, a stuffed bear, a clown, a yo-yo =
> 2. a ring, earrings, a wedding ring, a bracelet, a necklace =
> 3. Christmas, New Year's Day, Saint Nicholas Day, Labor Day =

Training in Analogy

In the second practice session, students in the experimental group were introduced to the notion of using an analogy to describe an item for which they did not have a precise lexical form. They were presented with the images of a sundial and a recamier sofa from previous sessions and asked to come up with analogies using the syntactic structure *c'est comme* (it's like). Student generated analogies included the following:

Sundial:
  c'est comme une montre (it's like a watch)
  c'est comme une montre pour le soleil (it's like a watch for the sun)

Recamier sofa:
  c'est comme une chaise (it's like a chair)
  c'est comme un sofa (it's like a sofa)
  c'est comme la chaise de Cléopâtre (it's like Cleopatra's chair)

Although not included in the training sessions with this particular group of students, one could easily imagine a vocabulary-building exercise using analogies along the lines of the following:

L'analogie. Trouvez une analogie pour chaque objet.

Modèle: a soup ladle: *C'est comme une grande cuillère*

1. a pitchfork
2. a kitchen timer
3. a grapefruit

Analogies. Give an analogy for each object.

Model: a soup ladle: *It's like a big spoon*

In fact, anticipating the results discussed following, it would no doubt be a good idea to include more practice with making analogies in class since students in both the control and experimental groups used very little analogy in either the pre- or the posttests.

Training in Function and Description

In the third and final practice session, students received instruction on the use of function and description in circumlocution introduced by the relative pronouns *qui* and *que* in the syntactic structure *C'est un/e X qui/ que/ où...* (It's an X that . . .). This instruction complemented work the students were doing in class on the appropriate use of relative pronouns. Here the link between form and function becomes quite clear: One means of effectively carrying out the task of circumlocution is to employ a linguistic form requiring a relative clause. Examples of sentences suggested by the instructor and generated by students in the prepractice session are provided here in two categories: function and description.

Function:

C'est une machine qui est utilisée pour mettre les papiers ensemble. (stapler)
(It's a machine that is used to put papers together.)
C'est quelque chose qui sert à agrafer les papiers. (stapler)
(It's something that is used to staple papers.)
C'est une chaise qu'on utilise pour faire dormir un enfant. (rocking chair)
(It's a chair you use to make a child sleep.)
C'est une chaise où on peut dormir. (recamier sofa)
(It's a chair you can sleep in.)
C'est pour ouvrir les lettres. (letter opener)
(It's to open letters.)

Description:

C'est une chaise qui est longue. (recamier sofa)
(It's a chair that is long.)
C'est une chaise qui a huit jambes. (recamier sofa)
(It's a chair that has eight feet.)

Like analogy, training in this category was limited to class brainstorming and examples provided by the teacher. However, the activity suggested next could have been used as well.

Décrivez! Donnez une description de chaque objet. D'abord décrivez sa fonction; ensuite décrivez un de ses caractéristiques.

Modèle:	a soup ladle	
	Fonction:	*C'est un objet qu'on utilise pour servir la soupe.*
	Description:	*C'est une cuillère qui est très grande.*

1. A pitchfork
2. A kitchen timer

Describe! Give a description for each object. First, describe its function; then describe one of its characteristics.

Model:	a soup ladle	
	Function:	*It's an object that is used to serve soup.*
	Description:	*It's a spoon that is very big.*

Results in Areas of Training

Somewhat surprisingly, students in the experimental group did not necessarily use more of each type of strategy presented in the prepractice training sessions. The use of superordinate terms, analogy, and description/function remained fairly constant between both groups of students. Table 2 provides data on the pretest scores for the three strategies targeted in this study while Table 3 provides posttest data. The tables list only the subset of the three circumlocution strategies which were targeted in practice. The total number of tokens of circumlocution strategies is greater than what is given in the tables.

Table 2
Pretest Data in Areas of Training

Strategy Used	Group	# Tokens	% Discourse
Superordinate Terms	Experimental Group	44	16.3%
	Control Group	48	21.9%
Analogy	Experimental Group	3	1.0%
	Control Group	2	1.0%
Function/Description	Experimental Group	193	71.5%
	Control Group	108	49.3%

For the pretest, the total number of tokens of all circumlocution strategies tallied for the experimental group was 270 and for the control group 219. These included tokens for L1- and L2-based strategies combined. Since, for the experimental group, for example, the number of tokens of superordinate terms was 44, the percentage of use of superordinate terms, in relation to all other circumlocution strategies, can be tabulated at 16.3 percent.

Data for the posttest is broken down into two categories: tabulations for items 1 through 4 (the same items used on the pretest) and tabulation for items 5 through 8. The last two columns in Table 3 compile the results of these two tabulations. The total number of circumlocution strategies used by the experimental group in discussing items 1 through 4 was 232, and 262 for items 5 through 8. For the control group the number of tokens for items 1 through 4 was 174, and 248 for items 5 through 8.

We see from these data that the use of superordinate terms increases slightly for the experimental group (from 16.3 percent of discourse to 20.6 percent), while it decreases slightly for the control group.[4] Use of analogy remains quite limited in both the control and the experimental

Table 3
Posttest Data in Areas of Training

		Items 1–4		Items 5–8		Total	
Strategy Used	Group	# Tokens	% Discourse	# Tokens	% Discourse	# Tokens	% Discourse
Superordinate	Experimental	52	22.4	50	19.1	102	20.6
	Control	40	22.3	47	19.0	87	20.6
Analogy	Experimental	4	2.0	6	2.0	10	2.0
	Control	1	1.0	4	2.0	5	1.0
Function/Description	Experimental	167	72.0	194	74.0	361	73.0
	Control	105	60.3	148	59.7	253	60.0

groups. Furthermore, the use of description (including description of function) as a strategy is strongly preferred by both groups of students during the pretest as well as the posttest. With this clear preference for description, it is somewhat surprising that students did not make more use of analogy given the similarities between the two structures. For example, the analogy *C'est comme une grande cuillère* (It is like a big spoon) is more or less equivalent to the descriptive phrase: *C'est une grande cuillère* (It's a big spoon).

In any case, the students' propensity to use description as an L2-based strategy was also clearly evident in students' responses to survey questions at the end of the study. Students in both the control and experimental groups were asked to complete statements such as "It helped me when my partner . . ." and "It was easy/difficult for me to describe/identify things which were. . . ." Students in the experimental group were also asked if the techniques they had been taught were useful and how often they made use of them. In completing the statement, "It helped me when my partner . . . ," 11 out of 18,[5] or 61 percent, of the students in the experimental group and 13 out of 15, or 87 percent, of the students in the control group provided a response that explicitly mentioned description, either physical such as shape, appearance, number, or functional (e.g., "what you do with it").

Discussion

Although both groups of students use superordinate terms at approximately the same rate during the posttest, it should be stressed that not all superordinates are created equally. Generic terms devoid of any particular lexical meaning, such as *chose* (thing) or *objet* (object), contain considerably less semantic content than words such as *un appareil* (apparatus), *un meuble* (piece of furniture), and *une machine* (machine). Note that the later superordinates signal that the object being described belongs to a certain class of objects, thus directing the listener's attention more precisely.

A tally of specific superordinates used during the pre- and posttests does not show an increased use of specific (as opposed to generic) superordinates at the time of the posttest for either the control or the experimental groups. Indeed, these data show great individual variation, both in the number of superordinate terms each student used as well as in the type. Some students consistently preferred specific superordinates, supplying words such as *meuble* (piece of furniture), *lumière* (light), and *jouet* (toy). Other students, while they may have supplied a great number of tokens of superordinate terms, used only the word *chose* (thing). These individual differences may stem from initial differences in level of proficiency and, hence, readiness to incorporate such terms into their vocabulary or from differences in perceptions about the utility of such specific superordinate terms. Some students clearly perceived the learning of these terms as important to the task. Of the eighteen students in the experimental group, three specifically state (in response to the questions: Did you find these techniques helpful? Why or why not?) that they made use of superordinate terms. As one student stated, "Yes, I used the words you told us to use like '*chose*' or '*apperiel*' [sic]."

Although we do not find clear gains made by the experimental group in the strategies targeted for practice, we nevertheless note the possibility that those exposed to training in specific circumlocution forms as well as practice in their use may exhibit generally improved rates of successful circumlocution as compared to those exposed to practice only. These findings warrant further study with a larger pool of participants. Given these findings, we would like to speculate that training in the strategies of circumlocution may be particularly beneficial to the *listener*, the person on the receiving end of the discourse. The training provided may better enable the listeners to identify the objects being described. Since, as language teachers, one of our goals is to train better listeners as well as better speakers, we are encouraged by these results.

We also note from these data that students in *both* the experimental and the control groups made significant gains in their ability to circumlocute successfully (as reflected in how successfully their partners could identify target items). It is possible, given these data, that practice alone, without specific training in forms, may result in improved rates of circumlocution. This hypothesis, likewise, warrants further investigation.

In addition to L2 strategies of circumlocution, which we targeted in this study, we noted another strategy used by a few students to help frame the ensuing discourse of circumlocution. Occasionally participants in this study would set up a context as a prelude to describing the object they wanted to order. Jourdain (1999) found that both native speakers and near-native speakers of French and English exhibit a strong preference for setting a context before ordering an item for which they do not possess the precise lexical term in either their native or second language. The two samples that follow, taken from the current study, clearly demonstrate the act of setting up a context as a vital part of describing an item for which the speaker has no lexical representation. In the first example, a student is describing a pitchfork on a page that contains other gardening tools.

BB: Je déteste mon voisin. Je besoin d'une chose qui je peux le tuer avec.

ES: (laughter)

BB: Il y a avec... quatre... choses qui je peux (sound effect)

ES: D'accord je vois.

BB: I hate my neighbor. I need a thing that I can kill him with.

ES: (laughter)

BB: There are with . . . four . . . things that I can (sound effect)

ES: Okay, I see.

In the following example, a student is describing a house built on stilts on a page with a variety of somewhat unusual houses.

ES: Aussi j'ai besoin d'une... mon dieu (laughter)... une maison.

BB: (laughter)

ES: Une "shack" pour ma famille parce que... nous sommes pauvres.

BB: Une "shack" de quoi?

ES: C'est [] une "shack" pour... pour quand... vous uh vous[z] habitez sur la Seine et chaque année la Seine... uh, "rise" [riz] et l'eau uh "flow-er" [floe] (laughter) sous ma maison et sa maison... est sur les "stilts" [stilts].

ES: Also I need a . . . my god (laughter) . . . a house.

BB: (laughter)

ES: A "shack" for my family because . . . we are poor.

BB: A "shack" of what?

ES: It's a "shack" for . . . for when . . . uh . . . you live on the Seine and each year the Seine uh "rises" and the water uh . . . "to flow" (laughter) under my house and his house . . . is on "stilts."

Data from this study are insufficient to determine whether the act of setting a context is particularly beneficial to the listener, contributing significantly to the successful identification of targeted items. Given its frequent occurrence in native-speaker interactions, however, we would argue that training in this "skill" would also be useful for both speakers and listeners.

Implications for Teacher Training

If, as we maintain, it is important to include training in circumlocution strategies in the foreign language classroom, then it also becomes important in the context of a multisection foreign language program to train graduate teaching assistants (TAs) about the importance and feasibility of incorporating such strategies into the classroom. This sort of training could be included in the presemester orientation program, in a practicum for first-semester TAs, or in a traditional methods course.

Wherever it is included, it seems naturally to fall under the umbrella of training in communicative competence (Canale 1983; Canale and Swain 1980; Savingnon 1997). While all of its components (grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence) should be addressed in a communicative classroom, the strategy of circumlocution is associated in particular with strategic competence, defined as "the effective use of coping strategies to sustain or enhance communication" (Savingnon 1997, p. 278).

Although anecdotal, virtually all TAs (and foreign language teachers in general) can relate stories about time spent in the target culture where their sophisticated, linguistic training left them in a bind when it came to asking for a specific item never mentioned in any of their university literature or culture classes. The relevance of employing circumlocution strategies in these situations becomes immediately clear.

We should also stress to TAs the usefulness of circumlocution in their role as foreign language teachers, for example when presenting new vocabulary items or trying to explain a word (in the target language) to students. Finally, we need to focus on circumlocution as a helpful way to provide structure for students to express themselves more efficiently in the target language.

Conclusion

We believe that one of the primary roles of all language instructors is to provide students with meaningful contexts in which to practice a variety of linguistic forms and functions. The activities described earlier create precisely such form-meaning links. In fact, the explicit training in circumlocution strategies that occurred prior to each practice session can be thought of as an instance of focus-on-form instruction (Doughty and Williams 1998; Long 1991). According to Long (1991) and Long and Robinson (1998), focus-on-form instruction should arise in a meaningful context when there is a particular need for attention to form due to problems with comprehension or production. In the case at hand, students had previously engaged in a circumlocution role-play (the pretest) and were somewhat frustrated by the problems they encountered in trying to order a particular item for which they lacked the precise lexical term. Learning that they would be engaging in the same type of activity again and recognizing the utility of such exchanges, the students were ready to focus their attention on specific linguistic forms (e.g., superordinates, analogy, function/description) that would help them in achieving their communicative goal.

We note in addition that students in the experimental group perceived the training they received to be beneficial. These students reported in the survey data that they did make use of the specific techniques on which they had been trained, and in response to "How often did you use these techniques?" ten out of eighteen (or 55 percent) of the students responded with a variation of either "all the time" or "very often."

Finally, circumlocution is a skill that students themselves find particularly relevant. As one student who participated in our initial work-abroad study noted after engaging in one of these circumlocution activities immediately before leaving for France: "This is good stuff though because this is probably what I'll be doing a lot of when I get there, this kind of like beating around the bush." We think that this sort of "beating around the bush" is a crucial skill and one that we should make every effort to foster in the foreign language classroom.

Notes

1. Initially, both researchers independently coded the transcriptions of two pairs of students. The coded transcriptions were then compared to

ensure interrater reliability. Additionally, all problematic cases were discussed before a particular coding was assigned.

2. The design of this experiment (a repeated measure test with students responding to a two-level factor, control versus treatment) lends itself to a two-way Repeated Measure ANOVA. Despite angular transformation, the data violated the assumption of normality forcing the use of a nonparametric test. The Mann-Whitney was the best suited to this data set due to its unequal sample sizes.
3. In the examples that follow, two items appear to be double-coded. In the case of analogies, we decided to provide more detail and, therefore, used precise coding to indicate shape analogies and size analogies. In tallying up the various strategies, only the fact that it was an analogy counted. However, in the case of the analogy/synonym example, both strategies appeared in the same utterance (analogy: *c'est une sorte de* and synonym: *réveil*). Hence, both of these categories received a mark in the tallying.
4. The data in Tables 2 and 3 are purely descriptive and are not intended to be interpreted as representing statistically significant similarities or differences.
5. The number of students who filled out the survey questionnaire was greater than the number of students whose data was tabulated in the prior tables. Tables 1–3 reflect only the data from students who participated in both the pre- and the posttests. Survey data were collected from all students in both classes.

Works Cited

Berry-Bravo, Judy. 1993. Teaching the Art of Circumlocution. *Hispania* 76: 371–377.

Bialystok, Ellen, and Maria Fröhlich. 1980. Oral Communication Strategies for Lexical Difficulties. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin-Utrecht* 5: 3–30.

Buck, Kathryn, Heidi Byrnes, and Irene Thompson, eds. 1989. *The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview Tester Training Manual.* Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Canale, Michael. 1983. From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In *Language and Communication*, edited by J. Richards and R. Schmidt, 2–27. London: Longman.

Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. 1980. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1: 1–47.

Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams. 1998. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Freed, Barbara. 1995. *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Joiner, Elizabeth, Annie Duménil, and James Day. 1994. *Vidéo Vérité.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jourdain, Sarah. 1999 (to appear). A Native-Like Ability to Circumlocute. *The Modern Language Journal* 84(2).

Lee, James, and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Liskin-Gasparro, Judith. 1996. Circumlocution, Communication Strategies, and the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: An Analysis of Student Discourse. *Foreign Language Annals* 29(3): 317–330.

Long, Michael. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective,* edited by K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch, 39–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, Michael, and Peter Robinson. 1998. Focus on Form: Theory, Research, and Practice. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 15–41. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Paribakht, Tahereh. 1985. Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency. *Applied Linguistics* 6(2): 132–146.

Savignon, Sandra. 1997. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice.* 2d ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Scullen, Mary Ellen, and Sarah Jourdain. 1997. To Teach or Not to Teach Circumlocution Strategies? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and the American Association of the Teachers of French, Nashville,Tennessee.

Yule, George, and Elaine Tarone. 1990. Eliciting the Performance of Strategic Competence. In *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*, edited by R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, and S. Krashen, 179–194. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Relationships between the Process of Reading, Word Inferencing, and Incidental Word Acquisition

Susanne Rott
University of Illinois at Chicago

Introduction

The rationale for reading as a significant source for second language (L2) learners' vocabulary development has its logical appeal. Krashen (1989, 1993), for example, argues that the elaborate properties of the lexical system cannot be learned through memorizing word lists alone but by processing and comprehending words in their various natural contexts as during reading. N. Ellis (1994) calls reading the "ideal medium" for vocabulary acquisition because the "word is frozen in time on the page, whereas in speech it passes ephemerally" (p. 40). In addition, Coady (1993, 1997; also N. Ellis 1994) argues in favor of reading as an essential source for L2 vocabulary gain because many low-frequency lexical items are encountered only in written text. He notes that low-frequency lexical items do appear in advanced and superior learners' passive and active lexical systems and that they could have gotten there only through reading. To acquire lexical items through reading as opposed to systematic practice is called "incidental word acquisition," and is the focus of the present research.

In their capacity as curriculum developers, language program directors (LPDs) have been concerned with providing L2 learners with a principled and systematic approach to lexical growth to speed up the rate of word learning and to address individual learner differences. While advances in second-language acquisition (SLA) research increasingly guide curricular decisions, research evidence about the usefulness of reading as a source of input for learners' vocabulary development has been inconclusive. The relationship between the process of text comprehension and the process of inferring the meaning of unfamiliar words that leads to lexical acquisition is not well understood.[1] Thus the purpose of the present study is to develop a clearer picture of the relationship between reading, word inferencing, and word acquisition by examining the three issues in one research design.

Psycholinguistic Processes Involved in Learning Vocabulary from Text

One recently raised issue concerns the relationship between comprehending textual propositions and acquiring forms. Researchers have proposed that comprehension and acquisition are two processes with separate functions. Sharwood-Smith (1986) explained that the "interpretation of input will [. . .] take two distinct forms: that which specifically involves extracting meaning from all relevant information perceived by the language user [comprehension], and that which involves the mechanisms responsible for creating (or restructuring) grammatical competence [acquisition]" (p. 239). Lee and VanPatten (1995) further defined the latter "mechanisms" as "making form-meaning connections from linguistic data in the input," (p. 96) which they call "input processing." To the best of my knowledge no research studies that have explicitly examined the relationship between the processing of unfamiliar words and text comprehension have been conducted. Only one study found a significant positive correlation between the quantity of target words (TWs) learned while reading and the amount of textual propositions comprehended (Rott 1997). Findings of the investigation were based on L2 readers' recall of textual propositions and suggested that readers who comprehended text better gained more words during reading. The study, however, did not explicitly assess whether and how learners processed the TWs. The present investigation was conducted to follow up on these findings using a qualitative analysis to examine the relationship between text comprehension, word inferencing, and word acquisition.

The Reading Process and Word Inferencing

Logically there must be some relationship between the processes of constructing the meaning of a text and making meaning of specific, unfamiliar words in that text. The nature of the relationship is, however, unclear because both processes have been investigated in four individual and separate lines of research: factors affecting text comprehension; word inferencing from context; and learners' strategic approaches both to reading and to assigning word meaning while reading.

Findings from reading research are reflected in L2 vocabulary studies. The mainly qualitative studies investigating the word inferencing process from context have identified three major factors that can have an impact on the outcome of inferencing. The investigations elicited details of text-based factors, such as learners' knowledge about the linguistic properties of an unknown word (Bensoussan and Laufer 1984; Haynes 1993; Na and Nation 1985) and context properties in which the unknown word appears (Bensoussan and Laufer 1984; Haynes 1993; Huckin and Bloch 1993; Mondria and Wit-DeBoer 1991), as well as learner-based factors, such as learners' metacognitive involvement and their strategic approach to inferring meaning (Chern 1993; Lee and Wolf 1997; Walker 1983; Wolf 1993). These factors can impede word-meaning assignment as well as have a conducive effect on it.

Ellis' (1994) model of word acquisition offers an analytical framework for the description of the mental activities involved in the word-learning process during reading. He integrates the areas of information processing and strategy use and emphasizes the readers' active involvement in the meaning assignment process, given that the reader applies word inferencing strategies with the purpose to comprehend text and not intentionally to learn vocabulary. The model comprises four factors: "(i) noticing novel vocabulary, (ii) selectively attending to it, and using a variety of strategies to try (iii) to infer its meaning from the context and (iv) to consolidate the memory for that new word" (p. 40).

It follows that reading, learners' attention to unfamiliar words, word inferencing, and the internalization of a new word are complexly interrelated processes. Until the exact nature of the relationships between these processes has been explored, it will not be possible to develop a comprehensive theory of vocabulary acquisition through reading.

Research Questions

The present study investigated three factors from Ellis' model, noticing, word inferencing strategy use, and word and text comprehension to determine their effects on word knowledge gained through reading. The following questions guided the study:

1. Do L2 readers notice the repeated occurrence of the TW in compound nouns?
    a. After how many exposures do readers assign meaning to a TW embedded in compound nouns?
    b. Do readers continue to be successful with assigning word meaning after the initial correct inference?
2. Are learners' use of reading strategies related to their use of strategies to infer meaning of compound nouns?
    a. Which strategies lead to successful word meaning assignment and to word acquisition?

The Present Study

Participants

The subjects were eight native speakers of English learning German as a foreign language at a large university in the Midwest. All subjects were enrolled in a third-semester course and can be considered low- and mid-intermediate learners. Since the data collection took place in the tenth week of the semester, it was possible to identify highly successful, average, and less-successful language learners in order to include in the study a variety of students typical of any language class. The overall class performance of three subjects could be categorized as highly successful, two as average, and three as less successful. To ensure that subjects did not have any prior knowledge of the target word (TW), a vocabulary pretest was administered. Subjects received a list of twelve German words including the TW and were asked to explain or define them in English. This was done one week before the researcher asked for volunteers to participate in the study.

Materials

The reading passage created by the researcher was fourteen sentences long. The researcher intentionally included words expected to be unfamiliar to the subjects besides, the seven occurrences of the TW, as well as complex sentence structures (subordinate clauses). Doing so should yield think-aloud protocols rich in data on the learners' thinking processes and should not result in a mere word-for-word or sentence-by-sentence translation task. The passage topic covered the German insurance system and described various insurance policies that many Germans have (see Appendix A).

The TW, *Versicherung* (insurance), appeared seven times in the reading passage and was used as part of a compound noun in each instance, a linguistic feature that is not exclusively German but typical for the German language. Multiple exposures to the TW in a variety of compounds allowed assessing the effect of readers' awareness of the TW. In creating the word set, the second noun of the compound could not be a cognate but could be a word familiar to the subjects. For greater variety, the TW appeared in first and second position of the compound noun: *Krankenversicherung* (health insurance), *Versicherungsschutz* (insuranceprotection), *Vesicherungsvertreter* (insurance agent), *Versicherungsmöglichkeiten* (insurance options), *Haftpflichtversicherung* (liability insurance), *Reiseversicherung* (travel insurance), and *Diebstahlversicherung* (theft insurance).

Instrumentation

A concurrent, introspective think-aloud protocol was used to gather data. It allowed for observing the subjects' cognitive processes (Ericsson and Simon 1993) as they read the text for meaning and attempted to assign meaning to unknown lexical items. In order to receive the most "natural" data, the think-aloud was unobtrusive. Only as subjects stopped verbalizing their thoughts did the researcher ask them to continue to say everything aloud. Additional data were collected during the debriefing, at which time subjects were asked to look back at the passage and recall the meaning of each TW or assign meaning if they had not done so during the initial reading. To determine vocabulary acquisition, subjects received an index card with the decontextualized TW and were asked to explain the meaning of the word in English. This was done immediately after they completed the think-aloud and was repeated two weeks later.

Data Analysis

To address the first research question, criteria were created to establish noticing of the TW. A TW was counted as noticed when learners (a) attempted to provide an English equivalent of the TW; (b) when learners made a comment about comprehension or miscomprehension of the TW; or (c) when learners demonstrated cognitive awareness of the importance of the TW for the passage by rereading it or making a comment about its reoccurrence.[2]

To address the second research question, the transcribed think-aloud protocols were first analyzed for the reading strategies learners used to comprehend the passage. The strategy classification employed was adopted from previous studies (Block 1986; Carrell 1989; Young and Oxford 1997), which presented rubrics of local and global strategies (see Appendix B). Next, the think-alouds were analyzed for word inferencing strategies. Instances in which the TWs occurred were examined in detail to assess learners' specific approaches for assigning meaning to unfamiliar words. The same strategy classification was used for word inferencing as for the analysis of reading strategies.

Results

Individual learner profiles were created. Table 1 provides a summary of each subject's reading and word inferencing strategy usage, the number of times each strategy was employed, the number of correct inferences, and the degree of awareness of the TW. Moreover, subjects are identified as successful, average, or less-successful classroom learners. Data analysis revealed three profiles of learners whose overall approach to reading and word inferencing was distinct: four learners used mainly local strategies; one learner used mainly global strategies; and three learners used a combination of local and global strategies. The following section will first present a summary of readers' mental activities, focusing on their awareness of the TWs and the effect of multiple exposures on learning. We next provide examples of learners' strategic approach to assigning word meaning and, finally, show which strategies led to successful inferences and acquisition. English translations of the input passage will be provided in round brackets.

Noticing, Inferencing, and Acquisition

Table 2 (p. 265) provides an overview of the number of TWs noticed, the number of correct inferences, and immediate and delayed word knowledge gain. The protocols showed that each reader noticed the TW in several contexts (4–7 times) by attempting to infer meaning, commenting on comprehension, or rereading the TW. Noticing was apparently not strategy-dependent. At least one learner from each profile group (local, global, combination) noticed all seven TWs. Noticing was somewhat related to the learners' overall success in the language class in that the three successful learners and the one average learner indicated noticing all seven TWs. In addition, the successful learners made not only the greatest number of

Table 1
Subjects' Strategy Use

	Reading Strategies		Word Inferencing Strategies	
Subject	**Local Strategies**	**Global Strategies**	**Local Strategies**	**Global Strategies**
F (less-successful learner)	attempts to translate every word skips words breaks lexical items into parts (does not lead to inference) monitor: questions meanings of words		inferences using immediate context (correct): 2[*] demonstrates awareness of TWs but does not infer meaning: 3 breaks TW into its two components: 1 skips TW (no allocation of conscious awareness): 1	
A (average learner)	attempts to translate every word skips words breaks lexical items into parts (does not lead to inference) monitor: questions meaning of words	mentions plan to gain information during reading: "we will find out"	inference using immediate context (conceptually correct but does not assign explicit meaning to the TW): 1 breaks TW into its two components: 2 tries different word categories: 1 skips TW (no allocation of conscious awareness): 3	

[*] Numbers indicate how many times the strategy was used out of 7 possible instances.

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

Subject	Reading Strategies		Word Inferencing Strategies	
	Local Strategies	**Global Strategies**	**Local Strategies**	**Global Strategies**
M (less-successful learner)	attempts to translate every word skips words uses grammatical knowledge (does not lead to inference) monitor: questions meaning of sentences monitor: questions meanings of words		using immediate context (correct): 1 use of grammatical knowledge: 3 demonstrates awareness of TWs but does not infer meaning: 1 skips TW (no allocation of conscious awareness): 2	
H (successful learner)	skips words	mentions plan to gain information during reading: "some of these words I cannot relate to them; I have to skip out and put them into context"	using immediate context (correct): 1 use of grammatical knowledge (aids inferencing of ensuing six TWs): 2 transferred knowledge from first inference (correct): 6	

L (successful learner)		mentions plan to gain information during reading: "we will find out when we keep on reading" uses inferences and draws conclusions		use of background knowledge: 7 conceptual inferences (four correct, one incorrect) elaborating on the context without assigning exact meaning to the TW: 5 lexically correct inferences: 2
C (less-successful learner)	(attempts to comprehend every word) rereading of unfamiliar words monitor: questions meaning of a clause or sentence monitor: questions meaning of words	speculates beyond information given in the text (based on misinterpretation of graphemic clues) uses inferencing and draws conclusions (based on accessing the wrong schema)	using immediate context (correct meaning assignment): 1 demonstrates awareness of TWs but does not infer meaning: 2	use of background knowledge: conceptual inferences, circumlocution of the meaning of the TW (incorrect): 4 attempt to integrate information from previous encounter with the TW to make meaning of the present TW (unsuccessful): 1

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

	Reading Strategies		Word Inferencing Strategies	
Subject	**Local Strategies**	**Global Strategies**	**Local Strategies**	**Global Strategies**
R (average learner)	skips words use of grammatical knowledge (does not lead to inference)	attempts to integrate textual information from previous ideas	demonstrates awareness of TWs but does not infer meaning: 4 breaks TW into its two components in combination with other strategies: 3	use of background knowledge: conceptual inferences, circumlocution of the meaning of the TW (two correct, one incorrect): 3
K (successful learner)	skips words monitor: questions meaning of words	integrated textual information (successful)	grammatical knowledge (conceptually correct inference): 1 skips TW after rereading previous encounters (noticing but no meaning assignment): 1 transferred knowledge from inference of the fifth TW: 2	transferred knowledge from inference from first TW (one correct one incorrect) in combination with background knowledge to assess the logic of the context: 2 integrating information from previous encounter with the TW leading to correct meaning assignment: 1

Table 2
Summary Table of Subjects' Cognitive Efforts

		Correct Inferences		Acquisition	
Subject	Noticing	Lexical	Conceptual	Immediate	Delayed
Local Strategy Users					
F (less successful)	6	2 (1, 6)	—	1	—
A (average)	4	—	1 (3)	—	—
M (less successful)	5	—	1 (1)	7	—
H (successful)	7	7 (1–7)	—	7	—
Global Strategy User					
L (successful)	7	2 (1, 2)	4 (3–6)	3	—
Combination Strategy Users					
C (less successful)	6	1 (1)	—	—	—
R (average)	7	—	2 (1, 5)	2	—
K (successful)	7	3 (5, 6, 7)	3 (1, 2, 3)	7	yes

Notes: Summary is based on 7 TW occurrences. Numbers in parentheses under the category Correct Inferences indicate which encounter is referenced.

correct inferences but also consecutive inferences. All but one of the average and less-successful learners inferred the meaning of the TW the first time they encountered it. But for subsequent encounters, they inferred meaning only sporadically in the remainder of the text. Likewise, as learning was assessed immediately after reading, three of the eight learners (two successful and one less-successful learner) recalled the meaning of the TW in all seven instances. Three readers recalled only some TWs (1–3 times), and two readers did not recall any. Only one learner who had noticed the TW at each encounter and was able to infer all words immediately after reading demonstrated productive word knowledge two weeks later. This learner, K, will be discussed in detail later.

Reading Strategies, Word Inferencing Strategies, and Acquisition

Unlike previous research that showed that type of strategy use is related to a particular proficiency level (Hammadou 1991; Lee and Wolf 1997; Wolf 1993; Wolff 1987), the individual learner profiles created from the current think-aloud protocols placed these third-semester learners (low- to mid-intermediate level) into three distinct groups of strategy users. Four readers who had difficulties decoding content and text structure relied heavily on morphosyntactic word features (local strategy users), characteristic for beginning learners. Three readers, though experiencing similar comprehension difficulties, used morphosyntactic and schema knowledge as well as intersentential context (local and global strategy users), characteristic for intermediate learners. The one reader who accessed the necessary background and schema knowledge (global strategy user) used strategies characteristic of advanced learners and native speakers. Successful text comprehension and word inferencing were not, in this study, associated with a particular group of strategy users. In both groups of local and combination strategy users one reader was successful while the others were less successful with text comprehension and TW meaning assignment.

The profiles of the learners all suggest that there is a strong relationship between reading and word inferencing strategies. Learners' strategic approaches to constructing meaning of the input passage reflected their use of strategies while making meaning of the unfamiliar TW. As shown in Table 1, all learners' use of reading strategies for passage comprehension was consistent with their use of word inferencing strategies. Due to the consistency of comprehension and word inferencing strategies, the following analyses focus only on the latter.

Local strategy users. Only one of four local strategy users, H, was a successful classroom learner. Learners F, M, and A, who were average or less-successful learners, approached constructing their discourse models with a word-for-word translation. Like the subjects in Bensoussan and Laufer (1984), these learners failed to recognize or make meaning of many of the words in the passage. They used but few local strategies (skipping unknown words predominated) without much success. Their meaning assignments depended heavily on the recognition and comprehension of words in the immediate context of the TW. Learner M, for example, made the following inference from local context:

> **Input Passage:** Alle Deutschen haben Krankenversicherung . . .
> (All Germans have health insurance . . .)
> **Learner Discourse:** all Germans have medical insurance that's
> what I am guessing from Kranken.

Learner F, also using the immediate context of the TW, made two lexically correct inferences. Learner M was able to infer the meaning of the first TW, and learner A inferred a conceptually acceptable meaning of the third TW.

The learners repeatedly expressed the vagueness of their guesses. Learner A questioned her comprehension of the sentence that introduces the concept of insurance agents:

> **Input Passage:** Für diese Gesellschaften arbeiten Versicherungsvertreter. (Insurance agents work for these companies.)
>
> **Learner Discourse:** oh no Gesellschaften companies . . . maybe, I don't know eh work Versicherungsvertreter which is maybe the workers . . . maybe.

Furthermore, these local strategy users recognized the TW as a compound noun. M verbalized the following:

> **Learner Discourse:** another . . . it got the same beginning as the other word but it is changed in the end.

Learner A, for example, replaced the TW with a placemarker in combination with the second noun of the compound saying aloud:

> **Input Passage:** Versicherungsmöglichkeiten (insurance options/possibilities)...
>
> **Learner Discourse:** something possibilities.

Learner M used his metalinguistic knowledge about features of the German language hampered his word inferencing process. He expressed his frustration with the TW *Versicherungsmöglichkeiten* (insurance options/possibilities) and German compound nouns explaining:

> **Learner Discourse:** from my experience I guess that is one of those German words which express an entire phrase like a feeling, like those governmental words.

This experience with "long German words" seems to have rather discouraged him from attempting to infer word meaning because he mentioned several times "again, it's too long." It is clear that word acquisition will not take place if a learner intentionally skips TWs. This finding is similar to one in Lee (1999), who found that comprehension difficulties impeded processing past tense morphology and that certain reading strategies (i.e., skipping unknown words) circumvented processing morphology.

Learner H, who also used mainly local strategies for reading comprehension and word meaning assignment, used fewer strategies overall but was more successful than the other local strategy users. The only reading strategy he used was to skip unfamiliar words, but, in contrast to learners A, F, and M, he recognized more words and comprehended the majority of the text propositions. Learner H approached word inferencing with an analysis of the grammatical features of the TW. He correctly comprehended words in the immediate context of the TW and recognized it as a compound noun by pausing between the two nouns while rereading it.

> **Input Passage:** Krankenversicherung (health insurance).
>
> **Learner Discourse:** Kranken [pause] versicherung...

Demonstrating intratextual awareness of the reoccurrence of the TW, he used the knowledge gained during the first encounter at every subsequent encounter, even as he failed to comprehend the content of some propositions. At each encounter, he separated the TW from its compound, translating it with two nouns. As he encountered a second part of the compound that he did not recognize, he translated it with the placemarker "something."

> **Input Passage:** Versicherungsschutz (insurance protection)...
>
> **Learner Discourse:** something with insurance again.

During the debriefing that followed the think-aloud protocol, learner A was not able to give the meaning of any of the TWs. Learner F gave only the first TW correctly. Learners M and H gave the correct meanings of all seven TWs. Two weeks later, however, none of these learners could recall the meaning of the TW, not even the two who assigned correct meaning to all seven compound nouns.

Global strategy user. Learner L was the only subject to approach text comprehension and word inferencing using mainly global strategies. Five times, learner L related textual information to her own knowledge about the topic, elaborated on the passage, and rephrased the context of the TW.

> **Input Passage:** Für diese Gesellschaften arbeiten Versicherungsvertreter. (Insurance agents work for these companies.)
>
> **Learner Discourse:** Versicherungsvertreter—probably people who have been trained to handle this kind of stuff.

Learner L was instantly satisfied with her broad conceptual inferences and did not attempt to gain the exact lexically correct meaning. She did, however, indicate her awareness of the vagueness of her inferences adding several times "probably" and "sounds like." For two TWs she used the lexically correct English translation. It is questionable, however, whether she made the form-meaning connection between the TW *Versicherung* and the English equivalent *insurance* because she incorrectly used insurance also for another noun, *Gesellschaft*, which means *company*, as well as for the TW. Moreover, she was not able to apply the TW knowledge she had gained through repeated correct inferences to make meaning of the seventh TW. After the think-aloud, when asked to recall the meaning of the TW, she again circumscribed the meaning of TWs one, two, and four. Learner L failed to supply the meaning of the TW two weeks after the reading treatment.

Combination of local and global strategy users. Learners C, K, and R approached reading comprehension and word inferencing with local as well as global strategic sources. Interestingly, they each represent a different type of classroom learner. While they all noticed the TWs in the passage, the number of correct inferences is low for the less-successful and average learners but quite high for the successful learner.

Although learner R used local as well as global strategies, he did not integrate these knowledge sources but rather used them independently for individual TWs. Using a local strategy, namely to question a word's meaning, learner R demonstrated awareness of four TWs by verbalizing "no idea." A second local strategy he used was to break the TW into its components which, in his case, did not help him to assign meaning as the following example shows.

> **Input Passage:** Die meisten Leute haben auch eine Haftpflichtversicherung. (Most people also have liability insurance.)
>
> **Learner Discourse:** Versicherung... um, most people have, um Haftpflichtversicherung.

During three TW encounters learner R used his background knowledge or elaborated on the input passage, a global strategy, to assign meaning to the TW. Recognizing words from the context, he circumscribed conceptually an incorrect meaning of the TW.

> **Input Passage:** Für diese Gesellschaften arbeiten Versicherungsvertreter. (Insurance agents work for these companies.)

> **Learner Discourse:** for this Gesellschaften maybe Versicherung is some kind of benefit many people have to work for this.

In two contexts he inferred meaning correctly and in one incorrectly. Looking back over the passage during the postreading debriefing, the learner made two conceptually correct inferences. Two weeks later learner R could not, however, recall the meaning of the TW.

While learners K and R used the local strategy of skipping unknown words, learner C attempted to comprehend every word. Learner C took twice as long to complete the think-aloud than the other learners because he reread individual words repeatedly. Even so, he did not infer correct word meaning. Learner C integrated information gained through the use of local and global strategies (in contrast to Learner R). He correctly inferred the lexical meaning of the TW, applying the schema of illness and recognizing the word *Krank* (sick) in the immediate context. Four other inferences were based on incorrectly interpreted textual clues (mostly graphemic misinterpretations) and the wrong schema. For instance, he misinterpreted the idea that insurance companies provide protection (*Versicherungsschutz*) as doctors giving people shots. Moreover, his elaboration of the text was based on stringing together words and imposing an interpretation on them. For example, he recognized the words *viel Geld* (a lot of money) and *arbeiten* (to work) and interpreted them as follows:

> **Input Passage:** Dafür gibt es große Gesellschaften, die diesen Schutz anbieten. Das kann oft sehr viel Geld kosten. Für diese Gesellschaften arbeiten Versicherungsvertreter. (There are big companies which offer this kind of protection. This protection can often be expensive. Insurance agents work for these companies.)
>
> **Learner Discourse:** these Gesellschaften [companies] it's like a worker maybe they work odd hours or something or maybe they don't make much money maybe Versicherungsvertreter maybe that means they don't make a lot of money.

Although subject C continuously monitored his inferencing process, expressing several times his insecurity about his inferences with "maybe," he appeared to be satisfied with his inferences saying "OK. I go on." At the fifth TW encounter, however, he assessed that he had miscomprehended the text and verbalized that his discourse model did not make any sense.

> **Input Passage:** Die meisten Leute haben auch eine Haftpflichtversicherung. Sie hilft, wenn man etwas von einer anderen Person kaputt macht, wie z.B. wenn man in einem Geschäft eine teure Vase zerbricht. (Most people have liability insurance. It covers, if one breaks something of another person, for example, in case one breaks an expensive vase in a store.)
>
> **Learner Discourse:** it's a visiting doctor I think . . . oh they may get a visiting doctor for a vase . . . oh no.

Demonstrating awareness of the reoccurrence of the TW, he reread previous encounters with the TW but was not then able to integrate the information to make sense of the present context.

> **Input Passage:** Für diese Gesellschaften arbeiten Versicherungsvertreter.... Da die Deutschen auch oft Abenteuerurlaube machen, schließen sie eine Reiseversicherung ab. (Insurance agents work for these companies . . . Because Germans often go on adventure trips they sign up for travel insurance.)
>
> **Learner Discourse:** Reise vacation Versicherung oh, so up here . . . Versicherungsvertreter and I thought that meant that they don't make much money, so perhaps that means they go on vacation with people that don't make much money.

At this point he gave up the attempt to make sense of the rest of the passage. During the debriefing learner C was seemingly exhausted, not being able or willing to look back in the text and assign meaning to the TWs. Learner C did not acquire the TW.

Learner K started out using local strategies that lead her to a conceptually correct inference of the first TW. She used words from the context of the TW and analyzed the TW for its graphemic feature, translating *Krankenversicherung* (health insurance) as "sickness security." Her inference was apparently influenced by recognizing the graphemic feature of "-sicherung" from *Versicherung* as a form of *Sicherheit* (security) which she had encountered and comprehended correctly in the previous sentence. Learner K then applied this knowledge in order to make meaning of TWs two and three. While the transfer of the conceptually correct inference of security made sense in both contexts, it made less sense in the context of TW four. At that point, she applied her background knowledge and displayed intratextual awareness by looking at previous encounters with the TW, but ultimately decided to skip the fourth TW. She then continued reading and gathered information from the ensuing context, arriving at the lexically correct translation of the TW by saying aloud,

> **Learner Discourse:** OK, OK so Versicherung might be insurance.

Although her use of "might" suggests insecurity about her inference, she transferred the lexically correct meaning to the following two encounters with the TW without hesitation. When she was asked after the think-aloud to recall the meaning of the TWs, she used the lexically exact meaning in all instances (including the first three and the fourth, which she had skipped) and explicitly mentioned that she had inferred the correct meaning as she had encountered the fifth TW. Learner K was unique among the eight subjects in that two weeks later she was the only one to recall the meaning of the TW.

Learner K's profile conforms to Ellis' (1994) strategic information processing model of word acquisition. It provides further details about the possible stages involved in learning a word: (i) the reader noticed the TW during the first encounter and each reoccurrence, (ii) attempted to infer meaning in each instance by (iii) using various local and global strategies, and (iv) demonstrated through a production test that she had internalized the word. Concerning the relationships between the individual stages, this reader interacted in depth with the text through a problem-solving approach by deriving meaning "on the basis of knowledge of language (target, native, or other) and of the situation [content of the text]" (Bialystock 1983, p. 105). She noticed linguistic features of the TW, recognizing it as a compound noun, and gained conscious conceptual understanding of its literal meaning by using background knowledge as well as local and intrasentential context.

Discussion

The impetus of the present study was to develop a better understanding of the mental processes involved in and the relationships between reading comprehension, noticing and assigning meaning to unfamiliar words, and word acquisition. The investigation discovered that for a small group of intermediate readers of German a combination of factors affects productive word knowledge gained as a result of reading.

All learners noticed most of the TWs; in 42 out of 49 possible encounters, the learners demonstrated noticing. Interestingly, all learners made an acceptable inference (i.e., exact or conceptual) of the word's meaning at their first encounter with it. But only two learners continued successfully to assign meaning in consecutive encounters, whereas four learners assigned meaning from varied encounters only. In other words, repeated noticing and correct-meaning assignment did not automatically result in knowledge transfer to ensuing encounters.

Although several learners could identify the meanings of the TWs, only one retained that knowledge two weeks later. This result is somewhat surprising, but it does lend support to the notion that word learning during reading is a cumulative, incremental process (e.g., Nagy, Anderson, and Herman 1987). This one reader noticed the compound feature of the TW during the first encounter, continued to notice the TW during consecutive encounters, but gained complete understanding only while processing the TW for the fifth time. Without question, multiple encounters during reading were crucial for this learner's acquisition of the TW. Via repeated encounters, the learner accumulated syntactic and semantic information about the TW. And yet, this learner was unique among the eight who participated in the study. Like this learner, two others assigned correct meanings to all seven targets immediately after performing the think-aloud. Unlike this learner, they could not identify the meaning of the TW two weeks later. These readers' think-alouds did not confirm the positive effect of multiple encounters with an unfamiliar word on lexical growth as suggested in the L1 and L2 literature (e.g., Jenkins, Stein, and Wysocki 1984; Nagy, Anderson, and Herman 1987; for a summary of early studies: Nation 1990; Rott 1999).[3] The number of subjects involved in the present study, however, is not sufficient to make conclusions on the issue of multiple exposures. Future research should seek to find more learners who acquire the target (i.e., retain it two weeks after exposure) and analyze their reading and word inferencing profiles for similarities.

The protocols further revealed that these L2 readers relied heavily on lexical recognition for text reconstruction. Present data lend support to Laufer's (1992) suggestion that the nature of the threshold for reading comprehension is not exclusively but largely lexical and that text comprehension requires about 95 percent vocabulary coverage. During their meaning construction of the passage local strategy users focused on word recognition and word inferencing and were only minimally concerned with understanding the larger concepts of the passage, that is, comprehension of individual ideas consisted of and depended on the number of familiar words and did not involve higher-order thinking skills for overall text understanding. Conversely, the learner who approached text comprehension and word inferencing with merely global strategies was concerned only with understanding the text on a conceptual level, focusing on neither familiar nor unfamiliar linguistic details. Her text and TW comprehension depended on the availability of background knowledge of the individual propositions that were activated by recognizing keywords from the passage. Those learners who combined the use of local and global strategies paid attention to linguistic detail and attempted to assimilate it with their conceptual understanding of textual ideas. Their comprehension depended on the correct recognition of the words in the context of the TW, the activation of the correct schema, and the availability of background knowledge.

With respect to the relationship between text comprehension, word inferencing, and lexical growth, the think-aloud data support the hypothesized distinction between the processes of comprehension and acquisition (Sharwood-Smith 1986). Even though all learners demonstrated TW recognition in multiple instances, all but one did not retain word knowledge. The two processes are indeed related (Lee and VanPatten 1995) in that they both initially deal with making meaning (of text or words). Yet, integration of words into the learner's lexicon apparently requires further processing as summarized in Hulstijn's (1992) "mental effort hypothesis." The two learners who successfully used only local or only global strategies seemed to interact less with the text either by simply transferring word knowledge (neglecting concept comprehension) or by being satisfied with a conceptual understanding (neglecting to assign concise meaning to the TW form).

These observations lend some support to Robinson's (1995) analysis of recent studies that incidental learning can be either a data-driven accumulation of instances or a conceptually driven process accessing schema in long-term memory. We can support his contention using the data on noticing and the data from the immediate postreading assessment of word learning. All learners noticed the TWs but did so in a variety of ways. Learners engaged a variety of word inferencing strategies and were successful in many ways. Even so, the data also suggest that Robinson's assertion may need refining. Only one learner retained word knowledge beyond two weeks. Is long-term word acquisition a data-driven or a conceptually driven process?

Conclusion and Implications

The most obvious limitation of the present study is its small number of subjects. While observations from this qualitative investigation cannot be translated into generalizations, they highlight the individual variation characteristic of language learning. Data from the present study suggest that describing incidental vocabulary gain as a "by-product" of reading really does not capture the range of cognitive processes involved in meaning assignment and word learning. The learner profiles suggest the following relationships, all of which are subject to further research:

1. There seems to be no relationship between simply noticing the recurrence of an unfamiliar word and long-term word knowledge gain. Noticing does not appear to result automatically in learning.
2. There seems to be no causative relationship between multiple exposures and long-term word knowledge gain. Long-term gains appear to be related to whether multiple encounters lead to an accumulation of additional information about an unfamiliar word.
3. Greater word learning seems to be related to greater text comprehension. Comprehending text, however, does not automatically result in productive word knowledge.
4. The types of text comprehension strategies learners employ are related to the types of strategies they use to infer word meaning.
5. Successful word inferencing seems to be related more to assigning meaning successfully to the words surrounding the TW than it is to the type of strategies used to infer word meaning.

Pedagogical implications from the present study are limited. But present observations suggest a need for a greater awareness and understanding on the part of the teacher as well as the student regarding comprehension problems when reading L2 texts. Findings warrant that language instructors need to be cognizant that learners with different approaches and with varying degrees of success in reading and word inferencing attend the same class. Although the trainability of reading and word inferencing strategies (Kern 1989) is inconclusive, learners need to reflect on their strategy use and to assess their individual success. Therefore language students need to engage in reading on a regular basis to receive repeated opportunities to assess their abilities and eventually increase their lexicon during reading.

Notes

1. To date, research lacks a refined definition of incidental word acquisition that includes a description of the cognitive mechanisms involved in assigning meaning to unfamiliar words during reading and storing lexical items in memory. Incidental vocabulary acquisition has been described as a "by-product" of reading comprehension, as learning while performing another task (e.g., Nation 1990; Schmidt 1995), or "in negative terms as the accidental learning of information without the intention of remembering that information" (Hulstijn et al. 1996, p. 327). The common thread running through these definitions is that they treat word gain during reading as a product. Such operationalization suggests that incidental word learning is a rather "unpredictable" process (Paribakht and Wesche 1996, p. 157) in which the L2 reader's role is that of a passive "recipient" of word knowledge, while being actively involved in reading text for meaning.
2. Regarding the relationship between learners' strategic approach to information processing, learning, and retrieval of new linguistic items, Robinson (1995) summarizes that there is a differential effect for data-driven and conceptually driven information processing. Both require conscious attention to the unfamiliar form in the input. But while data-driven processing results in the accumulation of instances leading to acquisition and in "automatic activation of previously attended information" (p. 317) during retrieval, conceptually driven processing involves accesses to schema and long-term memory leading to learning and requiring attentional control for retrieval.
3. The limited effect of exposure frequency could have been due to the treatment passage that was created for this investigation. Encountering an unfamiliar word seven times in the relatively short passage (twenty-four sentences) might have caused additional problems to make meaning of the TW and might have added to the readers' frustration. Usually multiple encounters with the same word happen over several paragraphs within one text or while reading different texts over a period of time.

Works Cited

Bensoussan, Marsha, and Batia Laufer. 1984. Lexical Guessing in Context in EFL Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading* 7: 15–32.

Bialystock, Ellen. 1983. Inferencing: Testing the "Hypothesis Testing" Hypothesis. In *Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition,* edited by Herbert W. Seliger and Michael Long, 105–123. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Block, Ellen. 1986. The Comprehension Strategies of Second Language Readers. *TESOL Quarterly* 20: 463–494.

Carrell, Patricia L. 1989. Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 121–134.

Chern, Chiou L. 1993. Chinese Students' Word Solving Strategies in Reading in English. In *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning,* edited by Thomas Huckin, Margot Haynes, and James Coady, 67–85. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Coady, James. 1993. Research in ESL/EFL Vocabulary Acquisition: Putting It in Context. In *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning,* edited by Thomas Huckin, Margot Haynes, and James Coady, 3–23. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

______. 1997. L2 Vocabulary Acquisition through Extensive Reading. In *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition,* edited by James Coady and Thomas Huckin, 273–290. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, Nick. 1994. Consciousness in Second Language Learning: Psychological Perspectives on the Role of Conscious Processes in Vocabulary Acquisition. *AILA Review* 11: 37–56.

Ericsson, Anders K., and Herbert A. Simon. 1993. *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hammadou, Joan. 1991. Interrelationships among Prior Knowledge, Inference, and Language Proficiency in Foreign Language Reading. *Modern Language Journal* 75: 27–38.

Haynes, Margot. 1993. Patterns and Perils of Guessing in Second Language Reading. In *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning,* edited by Thomas Huckin, Margot Haynes, and James Coady, 46–66. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Huckin, Thomas, and Joel Bloch. 1993. Strategies for Inferring Word Meaning in Context: A Cognitive Model. In *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning,* edited by Thomas Huckin, Margot Haynes, and James Coady, 153–180. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hulstijn, Jan H. 1992. Retention of Given and Inferred Word Meanings: Experiments in Incidental Vocabulary Learning. In *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*, edited by Pierre J. L Arnaud and Henri Bejoint, 113–125. London: MacMillan.

Hulstijn, Jan H., Merel Hollander, and Tine Greidanus. 1996. Incidental Vocabulary Learning by Advanced Foreign Language Students: The Influence of Marginal Glosses, Dictionary Use, and Reoccurrence of Unknown Words. *Modern Language Journal* 80: 327–339.

Jenkins, Joseph R., Marcy L. Stein, and Kathrine Wysocki. 1984. Learning Vocabulary through Reading. *American Educational Research Journal* 21: 767–787.

Kern, Richard G. 1989. Second Language Reading Strategy Instruction: Its Effects on Comprehension and Word Inference Ability. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 135–149.

Krashen, Stephen. 1989. We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 450–464.

______. 1993. *The Power of Reading*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Laufer, Batia. 1992. How Much Lexis Is Necessary for Reading Comprehension? In *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*, edited by Pierre J. L. Arnaud and Henri Bejoint, 133–145. London: Macmillan.

Lee, James F. 1999. On Levels of Processing and Levels of Comprehension. In *Advances in Hispanic Linguistics: Papers from the 2nd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, edited by Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach and Fernando Martínez-Gil, 42–58. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lee, James F., and Darlene Wolf. 1997. A Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of the Word-Meaning Inferencing Strategies of L1 and L2 Readers. *Spanish Applied Linguistics* 1: 24–64.

Mondria, Jan-Arien, and Marijke Wit-DeBoer. 1991. The Effects of Contextual Richness on the Guessability and the Retention of Words in a Foreign Language. *Applied Linguistics* 12: 249–267.

Na, Liu, and I. S. P. Nation. 1985. Factors Affecting Guessing Vocabulary in Context. *RELC Journal* 16: 33–42.

Nagy, William, Richard C. Anderson, and Patricia A. Herman. 1987. Learning Word Meanings from Context during Normal Reading. *American Educational Research Journal* 24: 237–270.

Nation, I. S. P. 1990. *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

Paribakht, Sima T., and Majory Wesche. 1996. Enhancing Vocabulary Acquisition through Reading: A Hierarchy of Text-Related Exercise Types. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 52: 155–178.

Robinson, Peter. 1995. Review Article: Attention, Memory, and the "Noticing" Hypothesis. *Language Learning* 45: 283–331.

Rott, Susanne. 1997. The Effect of Exposure Frequency and Reading Comprehension on Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition and Retention through Reading for Learners of German as a Foreign Language. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago.

______. 1999. The Effect of Exposure Frequency on Intermediate Language Learners' Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition and Retention through Reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21 (4).

Schmidt, Richard. 1995. Consciousness and Foreign Language Learning: A Tutorial on the Role of Attention and Awareness in Learning. In *Attention & Awareness in Foreign Language Learning,* Technical Report no. 9, edited by Richard Schmidt, 1–65. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Sharwood-Smith, Michael. 1986. Comprehension Versus Acquisition: Two Ways of Processing Input. *Applied Linguistics* 7: 239–255.

Walker, Laura J. 1983. Word Identification Strategies in Reading a Foreign Language. *Foreign Language Annals* 16: 293–299.

Wolf, Darlene F. 1993. The Relationship between Word Class and Word Meaning Inferencing Strategies in Foreign Language Reading. Paper presented at AILA, Amsterdam.

Wolff, Dieter. 1987. Some Assumptions about Second Language Text Comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 9: 307–326.

Young, Dolly J., and Rebecca Oxford. 1997. A Gender-Related Analysis of Strategies Used to Process Written Input in the Native Language and Foreign Language. *Applied Language Learning* 8: 43–73.

Appendix A

Treatment Passage (In the student version of the treatment passage, the TWs were not highlighted.)

Was tun die Deutschen für ihre Sicherheit?

Alle Deutschen haben **Krankenversicherung**, d.h. sie können einen Arzt besuchen, auch wenn sie arbeitslos sind oder nur wenig Geld verdienen. Aber da das Leben immer komplexer and vielseitiger wird, brauchen immer mehr Leute zusätzlichen **Versicherungsschutz**. Dafür gibt es große Gesellschaften, die diesen Schutz anbieten. Das kann oft sehr viel Geld kosten. Für diese Gesellschaften arbeiten **Versicherungsvertreter**. Sie haben kein Büro, sondern gehen von Haus zu Haus and besuchen Leute. Dabei erklären sie den Leuten welche Art **Versicherungsmöglichkeiten** es gibt. Die meisten Leute haben auch eine **Haftpflichtversicherung**. Sie hilft, wenn man etwas von einer anderen Person kaputt macht, wie z.B. wenn man in einem Geschäft eine teure Vase zerbricht. Dann bezahlt die Gesellschaft für die Vase. Da die Deutschen auch oft Abenteuerurlaube machen, schließen sie eine **Reiseversicherung** ab. Falls sie z.B. von einem Hubschrauber aus den Bergen gerettet werden müssen, oder wenn ihr Gepäck gestohlen wird, bekommen sie das Geld von der Gesellschaft zurück. Aber gestohlen wird nicht nur im Ausland. Das passiert auch in Deutschland, besonders Fahrräder and Photoapparate werden oft gestohlen. Deshalb haben viele Leute eine **Diebstahlversicherung** für wertvolle Gegenstände.

Appendix B

Strategy Classification Scheme

Strategy	Definition
Local Strategies:	
States understanding of words/ vocabulary.	The reader acknowledges comprehension based on knowing all the words.
Skips specific, unknown words.	The reader states that he/she skipped a word that was not known.
Breaks lexical items into parts.	The reader breaks words and phrases into smaller units to figure out the word/phrase.
Uses cognates between native language (NL) and foreign language (FL) to comprehend.	The reader expresses ease of understanding because of words that look and mean the same in the NL/FL.
Solves vocabulary problems.	The reader uses context, a synonym, or some other word-solving behavior to understand a particular word.
Questions meaning of a word.	The reader does not understand the meaning of a particular word.
Questions meaning of a clause or sentence.	The reader indicates that he/she does not understand the meaning of a portion of the text.
Uses knowledge of syntax and punctuation or other grammar.	The reader expresses awareness of grammar, syntax, and other parts of speech or punctuation.
Monitors reading pace and reading behavior.	The reader makes reference to slowing down, rereading, or perhaps reading on in spite of not understanding some things. The reader mentions specifically that he/she went back and read something again, or the reader indicates using information that is more than a sentence away.
Paraphrases	The reader rewords the original wording of the text.
Global Strategies:	
Skims, reads heading, subtitles.	The reader previews text to get a general idea of what the article is about before actually reading the text.
Anticipates content.	The reader predicts what content will occur in succeeding portions of text.
Recognizes text structure.	The reader distinguishes between main points and supporting details or discusses the purpose of information or notes how the information is presented.

(Continued)

Appendix B: Strategy Classification Scheme (*Continued*)

Strategy	Definition
Integrates information.	The reader connects new information with previously stated content.
Reacts to the text.	The reader reacts emotionally to information in the text.
Speculates beyond the information in the text.	The reader has a thought that goes beyond the information contained in the text.
Acknowledges lack of background knowledge.	The reader states lack of familiarity with or knowledge about the text topic.
Reads ahead.	The reader specifically mentions reading ahead as he/she reads.
Visualizes.	The reader indicates that he/she had a mental image.
Identifies main idea.	The reader related major points of paragraph or passage.
Uses inference or draws conclusion.	The reader indicates that he/she guesses based on information in text and own knowledge.
Uses background knowledge.	The reader states a familiarity or knowledge about the text topic.

Sources: Adapted from Block, 1986; Carrell 1989; and Young and Oxford 1997.

LINKING FORM AND MEANING IN READING: AN EXAMPLE OF ACTION RESEARCH

Catherine C. Fraser
Indiana University

Background

The data and observations to be described in this paper are the result of action-based research or, to use Ellis' (1990) term, "classroom process research," which he defines as "concerned with the careful description of the interpersonal events which take place in the classroom as a means of developing understanding about how instruction and learning take place" (1990, p. 64). Although one characteristic of such research is that it is primarily based on observation rather than being "theory-led," Ellis notes that there is always some underlying hypothesis, something that piques the interest and suggests an experiment. In this case, Berkemeyer's (1994) study, "Anaphoric Resolution and Text Comprehension for Readers of German," provided the theoretical underpinning for the study and something to "look for" within the broader context of researching ways to teach foreign language texts effectively.

One might argue that the activity of reading is, first and foremost, a linking of meaning to form through decoding. This used to be interpreted as a laborious looking up of unfamiliar vocabulary, which was subsequently tested in some way or another, often sending the message that the main point of reading was to learn low-frequency vocabulary items. While those researching reading in the past fifteen years or so have led—or attempted to lead—the profession away from encouraging L2 readers to follow traditional bottom-up approaches and have emphasized the value of top-down strategies (using background knowledge and familiarity with genre) at all levels of language learning, the most recent research has focused on how the two can be integrated. The next question raised regards which types of activities—both bottom-up and top-down—are most effective. Scholars have pointed to the need for L2 readers to look beyond content words and foster an awareness of function words and those elements that provide cohesion or coherence to a text (cf. Barnett 1989; Bernhardt 1991; Swaffar, Arens and Byrnes 1991). Barnett (1989) pointed out that for students reading in a foreign language "syntax can be troublesome, especially with regard to *reference words* (e.g., relative pronouns, demonstrative adjectives and pronouns, object pronouns, possessive adjectives)" (p. 129). She went on to say that "[F]oreign language reference words might be syntactically difficult, might encourage erroneous first language transfer, or might be skipped as unimportant"(p. 129). With this in mind, she advocated reading tasks that require students to "find the word or idea to which each underlined reference word refers" and suggests that "the teacher may need to explain the difference between *anaphora*, reference to something preceding the reference word, and *cataphora*, reference to something following the reference word" (p. 130). Moser, Young, and Wolf (1997), the authors of *Schemata*, a recently published German reader, are to be commended for putting many of the newer L2 reading theories into practice. In their book they include exercises that focus readers' attention on decoding by means of prefixes and suffixes (pp. 23, 25), guessing meaning from context (p. 56), focusing on words that negate meaning (p. 118) or qualify statements (p. 137), identifying sentence types (p. 132), and conjunctions (p. 154). However, there is nothing on anaphora and cataphora.

Although most foreign language educators have now moved beyond the debate of "whether or not" to teach grammar to "how" to teach it (Lee and VanPatten 1995, p. x), and agree that grammar should be taught within a meaningful context, I suspect that there is hesitation to introducing exercises of this type for fear of recalling the old days of the "grammar translation method." If students were asked only to label the pronoun type, this objection would certainly be valid. However, the task can focus on the role certain grammatical forms play in discourse cohesion. As Berkemeyer (1994) states in her concluding paragraph, "Grammar instruction needs to be contextualized so that readers can learn to use their linguistic knowledge more efficiently and effectively during reading" (p. 21).

Another more productive label for this type of task is "consciousness raising." Ellis (1990) points out that this "differs from traditional grammar-teaching in that it sees form-focused instruction as a means to the attainment of grammatical competence, not as an attempt to instill it. Consciousness raising aims to facilitate acquisition, not to bring it about directly. It recognizes that the learner will contribute to and shape the process of acquisition herself" (1990, p. 15ff). In discussing the opposing views of Prabhu and Rutherford on the matter of whether "a linguistic focus, in the form of grammatical consciousness-raising activities, should be incorporated into task design" (Nunan 1989, p. 38), Nunan points out that: "While in some ways the top-down, bottom-up distinction corresponds to the distinction between form-focused and meaning-focused tasks, there is no one to one correspondence" (p. 38). To pursue his discussion to its next logical step, one could argue that a task that helps L2 readers link form and meaning will be more beneficial than one that separates the two elements. However, the question of whether L2 readers need labels for the forms is another matter.

Relevant Research

Berkemeyer (1994) conducted a study on just this aspect of text decoding for readers of German. The purpose was "to determine if readers of German are able to identify correctly the coreferents of various anaphoric expressions in a German text and if this ability is related to their overall comprehension of the text and their baseline German language ability" (p. 16). Fifty American subjects and four native speaker/readers of German were first tested for baseline language ability and then given a text on recent German history, selected because "(a) it was an authentic, naturally occuring text, and (b) it contained a high density of anaphoric expressions" (p. 17). Comprehension of the text as a whole was assessed by means of recall protocols written immediately after reading the passage and scored following the procedures described by Bernhardt (1988, cited by Berkemeyer). In addition, subjects were given a coreferent selection task. This consisted of "a copy of the expository text in which the anaphoric references of interest were underlined" (Berkemeyer 1994, p. 17). The score on this task was determined by the number of correctly identified coreferents for the underlined expressions. The scoring instrument was created by a native speaker to insure that all "syntactically and semantically appropriate coreferents were considered" (p. 17). In the subsequent correlation analysis, Berkemeyer demonstrated a significant connection between "coreferential tie comprehension and overall text comprehension" (p. 17), suggesting that "certain linguistic processing skills, such as the ability to resolve anaphoric expressions, do contribute significantly to readers' abilities to comprehend written discourse" (p. 17). She also found a significant correlation between "baseline German language ability and coreferential tie comprehension" (p. 17).

Based on Berkemeyer's findings, there is reason to assume that tasks focusing on anaphora and cataphora, features that link microforms to a larger meaning, if presented with a minimum of grammatical terminology but stressing the link between form and meaning, could well help L2 readers to develop a sensitivity to elements of cohesion and coherence in a text. They will also pinpoint misunderstandings and possibly lead to discussions of meaning in a text where various interpretations are possible.

As with so much in task design, the effectiveness depends on the learner's perception. If L2 readers perceive an activity as designed solely to test a knowledge of linguistic labels, to detect errors, and one that will inevitably lead to a lecture on case usage, then the constructive, facilitating aspect would certainly be lost. If a student's (essentially correct) link to a noun rather than to a noun phrase, that is, without its article and any modifying adjective, were marked as incorrect, then this could easily be labeled a pedantic grammar exercise and a source of frustration to the student who had followed the cohesive elements of the text correctly but had not paid attention to linguistic technicalities. If, however, the main feedback given to students was on interpretation, on linking the pronominal forms to their meaningful referents, then the activity can be defended as constructive.

Though the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for reading have been shown to lack "predictive capability" across text types and skills (Lee and Musumeci 1988, p. 180), they do nevertheless raise some relevant points for this project, particularly in the subskill of "decoding and classifying" which, as Lee and Musumeci (1988) pointed out, "forces the reader to operate strictly within the linguistic boundaries of the texts" (pp. 176, 182). In describing the intermediate-high reader (typically students in the fifth or sixth or even seventh semester in German) the guidelines state: "Has some difficulty with the cohesive factors in discourse, such as matching pronouns with referents" (ACTFL 1986). The guidelines for writing describe the advanced foreign language writer as follows: "Uses a limited number of cohesive devices, such as pronouns, accurately" (ACTFL 1986). It would seem then that an activity designed to focus the attention of L2 readers on cohesive devices in authentic texts might also provide a form of structured input on which to model writing output. Again, Ellis' (1990) research provides further justification: "Conscious knowledge of marked forms may help to accelerate learning and may also be necessary to prevent fossilization" (p. 170).

To return to the focus of this volume and define the way in which the terms "form" and "meaning" are being used in this paper requires a brief description of the German language for those unfamiliar with it. German has three genders: masculine, feminine, and neuter. Nouns, articles, and pronouns are inflected to indicate number and case—nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive, of which the genitive is becoming less commonly used and has only archaic forms for pronouns. Another pertinent fact about German is that a verb cannot stand alone without a subject marker, cf. English, "there is a tavern in the town" where the grammatical form "there" can be seen as referring to the noun phrase "a tavern in the town" or simply as a subject marker. Thus while most pronouns (including relative pronouns) can be linked to their coreferents by reason of case, gender, or both, and thus carry a distinct meaning for the reader of the text, there are some that are arguably without meaning and are just fulfilling a formal grammatical function. In *Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache*, Harald Weinrich breaks down pronoun types further, labeling the neutral *es* opening a clause in a comparable way to "there" in the phrase "there is a tavern in the town," as a "*Horizont-Pronomen*" (p. 389). He goes on to distinguish between textual and situational "horizons." The former refers to a situation "...wenn sich das Horizont-Pronomen *es* als genus-, numerus-, und kasusneutrale Form in unspezifischer Weise auf kürzere oder längere Abschnitte des Vortextes bezieht" (p. 391) (. . . when the horizon pronoun *es*—a form which is neutral as regards gender, number, and case—refers in an unspecified way to a shorter or longer excerpt of the preceding text). These "textual" pronouns are the ones that truly test comprehension at a macrolevel. Again, I would hesitate to discuss the various scholarly labels with L2 readers, but I would look for such forms in selecting texts for tasks focusing on anaphoric resolution.

Methods and Procedures

Subjects

The subjects of this experiment were twenty-eight students, twenty from a large state university and eight from a small liberal arts college. Since this was an informal experiment, complete background information on each subject is not available. In general, students had either placed into the course based on previous high school instruction or had completed a language requirement sequence at the college level. Two subjects had Bulgarian as their first language, while the others were from the United States with English as a first language. All were in third-year-level (fifth or sixth semester) courses in which language skills were developed through a variety of communicative activities, including reading a popular crime novel. Typical classroom activities in both groups included illustrating and acting out scenes from the novel, as well as more traditional questions on the plot and speculation as to how the mystery would unfold. I asked colleagues teaching the courses to assign the task at their convenience toward the end of the semester when the text had been read. I was not present while students were completing the exercise.

Materials

A Swedish textbook (Mathlein 1983) with activities designed to improve reading comprehension provided the impetus for the task to be described. Readers were required to link selected italicized pronouns in a short passage to their referents. The task had the appeal of a crosswood puzzle—it was entertaining as well as challenging, and there was a certain sense of accomplishment upon completion. The model also lent itself to adaptation for an activity in German, and since both groups had read the same 266-page, popular, contemporary mystery novel, excerpts were selected from pages 50 and 105–6. In selecting passages and pronouns to test, I had looked for a mix of personal pronouns, both singular and plural, relative pronouns, neutral subject markers, and pronouns referring to phrases (Weinrich's "textual" pronouns). I was also looking for excerpts that would not rely too much on a reader's memory of the text for connections to be clear. In the directions for task completion, given in German, I used a minimum of linguistic terminology, although the heading on the exercise—An Exercise for Checking Anaphora and Cataphora in *Der Hahn Ist Tot* (Noll 1991)— may have been helpful for the linguistically sophisticated reader. I pointed out that German requires a subject marker, and thus it was possible that a neuter pronoun *es* was being solely used in that function, in which case they need only link the pronoun to the verb for which it was serving as subject. This offered students the opportunity to label all such pronouns as meaningless forms, and the responses were considered "correct" if they did so, as well as if they linked the pronoun to a phrase. To return to the example—there is a tavern in the town—"there" could be linked to "a tavern in the town" or labeled as a subject marker and be considered correct either way. The first pronoun in the exercise provided an example for the students who were asked simply to indicate connections by drawing lines from the underlined and boldfaced pronouns to their referents.

Scoring

In deciding whether a pronoun was linked "correctly" to its referent, I was not concerned with total precision. For example, if a third-person plural pronoun referred to all members of a family mentioned in two different places in the text, a linking to one of these was sufficient to be considered "correct." Similarly, I was not looking for technical linguistic correctness, for example, linking to a full noun phrase as opposed to just a noun. For example, in item 14, the relative pronoun *der* refers to the noun phrase "den lasziven seidenen Schlafanzug" (the lascivious silk pajamas), but a response circling only "Schlafanzug" (pajamas) was accepted. Such responses were correct at the level of meaning and understanding the text, and so for the purposes of this experiment, no distinction was made at the technical level.

Results

I had expected to find that the easiest items for students to mark would be personal pronouns referring to characters in the text (items 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 15). As Berkemeyer (1994) pointed out in her study: "American readers of German, particularly beginning level language users, are expected to be strongly influenced by their knowledge of English when interpreting gendered anaphoric references in German text" (p. 16). A feminine pronoun is thus far more likely to be linked to a person than to an inanimate object, although both are grammatically feminine. I suspected the next level of difficulty would be determined by those pronouns referring to previously mentioned objects or phrases (item 11), with the third level being relative pronouns (items 2 and 14)—I expected those in the nominative case to be the easiest to identify. The textual pronouns, the uses of the third-person singular neuter *es* as subject marker (items 3, 7, 8, and 13) are ones I expected would be either labeled as such, given the hint in the directions, or even ignored as less important to the meaning of the text as whole. I did not really expect students to spend much time searching for meaningful links.

Table 1
Responses Arranged in Order of Accuracy with Response Types Combined in Items 3, 7, 8, and 13.

Items	Description/ Identification	Correctly Connected to Referent	Incorrectly Connected to Referent	Ignored by Student	Totals
2. der	feminine dative relative pronoun	25	3	0	28
4. er	singular personal pronoun	23	3	2	28
12. er	personal pronoun	22	3	3	28
13. es	textual pronoun	22	3	3	28
6. er	personal pronoun	21	4	3	28
9. sie	personal pronoun	20	5	3	28
14. der	masculine nominative relative pronoun	20	6	2	28
15. ihn	personal pronoun	20	6	2	28
10. sie	personal pronoun	19	6	3	28
5. sie	plural personal pronoun	16	10	2	28
7. es	textual pronoun	12	13	3	28
8. es	textual pronoun	10	9	9	28
3. es	textual pronoun	7	13	8	28
11. es	referring to an unknown person about whom the speaker is conjecturing	2	18 (7 @ a)	8	28
Totals		**239**	**102**	**51**	**392**

The first surprising finding was the low level of accuracy of the student responses, indicating an unexpected level of misreading (see Table 1). One fear I had was that the task might be too simple at the stage in the semester it was given, since students had already talked about the text in class and would supposedly have eliminated some basic misreading, but this was not the case. Not one item was identified correctly by all 28 students, and no student had a perfect score. Two of them managed to match up only two pronouns accurately with their referents. The following charts—first giving the results in descending order of accuracy and then broken down by pronoun type—show the responses with correct and incorrect identification, as well as the number of occasions in which the item was overlooked or ignored. The third category could, of course, be linked with "incorrect," but another interpretation is that the L2 reader overlooked the pronoun because it was "meaningless" when decoding the text. In order to make this finer distinction, more data would need to be collected, but I believe it is important in tabulating responses to distinguish between the two types. The full results in order of item appearance in the text excerpts are given in Appendix B.

Though these results generally support Berkemeyer's (1994) hypothesis about personal pronouns being the easiest, there are some surprises. The "easiest" item, item 2 ("Ich kenne keine Frau von fünfzig, der das große Glück über den Weg läuft"—I don't know of any fifty-year-old woman, for whom good fortune crosses her path[1]), the one that produced the highest number of correct responses, was "easy" for only 25 out of the 28 students, or 89 percent. I had expected this item, a feminine dative relative pronoun, to cause students some difficulties. Perhaps the position in the exercise as the first item to be linked by students attracted attention, and the pressure of time had not become a factor. The item did, however, divide the two lowest scorers—one linked the item correctly to its referent, but the other did not.

The next easiest, item 4 ("Er ist verheiratet"—he is married) was identified correctly by 23 students (82 percent) and the next, item 12 ("beim ersten kranken Tag brauchte er mich weder zu kontrollieren..."—on the first sick day he doesn't have to check up on me) by 22 (79 percent). Table 2 illustrates how these and other personal pronouns generally fit expectations.

With only two examples of relative pronouns (see Table 3), it is impossible to make generalizations, but the fact that the dative feminine was "easier" than the nominative masculine is surprising.

The items of prime interest for this study were, however, the textual pronouns—the four pronouns that could be regarded as meaningless forms. These are shown in Table 4 with responses broken down into both acceptable interpretations, that is, linking the neuter pronoun to a phrase or labeling it as a subject marker. As a group these textual pronouns were the most challenging for the subjects of this study, with the exception of item 13.

Table 2.
Personal Pronouns (Third Person Forms) Referring to Characters in the Text

Item Number	Number, Gender, and Case	Correctly Connected to Referent	Incorrectly Connected to Referent	Ignored by Student	Totals
4. er	singular, masculine, nominative	23	3	2	28
5. sie	plural, nominative	16	10	2	28
6. er	singular, masculine, nominative	21	4	3	28
9. sie	singular, feminine, accusative	20	5	3	28
10. sie	singular, feminine, nominative	19	6	3	28
11. es	neuter, nominative, singular, referring to an unknown person about whom the speaker is conjecturing	2	18 (7 @ a)	8	28
12. er	singular, masculine, nominative	22	3	3	28
15. ihn	singular, masculine, accusative	20	6	2	28
Totals		143	55	26	224

a - the student linked the pronoun with the verb *angerufen*, a logical conclusion although incorrect

Table 3
Relative Pronouns

Items	Gender and Case	Correctly Connected to Referent	Incorrectly Connected to Referent	Ignored by Student	Totals
2. der	feminine dative, referring to a woman	25	3	0	28
14. der	masculine nominative, referring to an inanimate object	20	6	2	28
Totals		45	9	2	56

Table 4
Textual Pronouns

Items		Correctly Connected to Referent	Incorrectly Connected to Referent	Ignored by Student	Totals	
1. das	refers to a phrase given to students as an example					
3. es	subject marker- (Es gibt)	5	13	8	26	
	linked to phrase	2			2	28
7. es	subject marker	2	13	3	18	
	linked to phrase	10			10	28
8. es	subject marker	2	9	9	20	
	linked to phrase	8			8	28
13. es	subject marker	3	3	3	9	
	linked to phrase	19			19	28
Totals		51	38	23		112

To save the reader from referring back and forth to the exercise in Appendix A, the items with translations are listed here:

> Es (3) gibt überhaupt nur kleines oder kurzes Glück. (Anyway, there is only minor or short-term happiness.)
>
> Aber es (7) fiel mir ein, daß ich mich offiziell krank gemeldet hatte; (But it occurred to me that I had officially called in sick.)
>
> es (8) war immerhin möglich, daß der Chef den eiligen Vorgang auf meinem Schreibtisch einer Kollegin in die Hand gedrückt hatte.... (It was still possible, that the boss had handed a colleague the pressing matter on my desk . . .)
>
> Wie wunderbar wöre es (13) gewesen, wenn ich sein Kommen geahnt hätte. (How wonderful it would have been, if I had suspected his arrival.)

The correct responses to these items given in Table 4 can further be broken down as follows and the results are presented in Tables 5 and 6. These tables indicate that the majority of these groups of L2 readers preferred to assign a meaning to a form than to give it a linguistic label.

Table 5
Breakdown of Responses Accepted as Correct

Textual Pronouns	Students Identifying the Pronoun as a Subject Marker	Students Linking the Pronoun to a Phrase
Item 3	5	2
Item 7	2	10
Item 8	2	8
Item 13	3	19
Totals	**12**	**39**

Table 6
Breakdown of Incorrect Responses

Textual Pronouns	Incorrect Linkings	Item Ignored or Overlooked
Item 3	13	8
Item 7	13	3
Item 8	9	9
Item 13	3	3
Totals	**38**	**23**

Again it is apparent that more students looked for a meaning than ignored the form for all but item 8. In fact, the maximum number of times an item was ignored was for that item, with items 3 and 11 being overlooked eight times each. My interpretation is that items 3 and 8 were ignored as being unimportant, while students failed to indicate form/meaning links in item 11 because it was problematic for them.

Without question, item 11 produced the most interesting responses. The neuter pronoun *es* in the sentence "Oder war es der Chef selbst?" (Or was it the boss himself?) refers to an unknown person about whom the speaker is conjecturing and for whom no immediately clear link can be made in the excerpt given. Some thought and creativity based on a global understanding of the passage were required to link the pronoun with a suitable referent. The brief excerpt from the text provides sufficient information for the reader to deduce that the unknown person is at the door.

The opening phrase "Nicht aufmachen!" (Don't open!) provides the clue here, but the first person narrator goes on to tell of her fears that someone might not believe her story of being ill and thus unable to go to work, that her boss might have some urgent work for her and give this to a colleague, but then that the colleague would have phoned before coming. The next fear the narrator expresses is that the person knocking at the door could even be her boss. The colleague, the boss, or the unknown person (*Menschenseele*) referred to in the phrase "So häßlich, wie ich im Augenblick bin, sollte mich keine Menschenseele zu Gesicht bekommen!" (Not a soul should have to look me in the face when I'm as ugly as I am at the moment) were all considered correct following the experiment's prime criteria of linking form to a defensible meaning.

The narrator's reflections led seven students to link the pronoun with the past participle *angerufen* (phoned). Though an incorrect interpretation, this is a logical reading of the text and, I suspect, a linkage that a native speaker might make when reading quickly and without longer reflection. This is the type of response that could be discussed in a classroom setting, not as a grammatical exercise, but more one of close reading.

The students with the highest number of accurate linkings exhibited certain characteristics throughout their responses, showing a consistency in their approaches to decoding the text excerpts. (See Appendixes C and D for responses of the individual subjects, divided by group). Two students from the smaller college group were among the top scorers with 12 correct out of 14 (86 percent). Both students (CI and CK) confirmed my expectations that the tip to label a pronoun as a subject marker would be useful to some students. CI marked items 3, 7, 8, 11, and 13 as such, and CK labeled 3, 7, 8, and 13 as subject markers. Of these, only item 11 (the problematic one discussed earlier) was incorrect. The top score in the larger group was also 86 percent. Of the four students with this score, three (UG, UR and UT) did not label any pronoun as a subject marker, and one, UP, did. He followed the pattern of the top C group students and labeled 3, 7, 8, and 13 as such. These responses may reflect a difference in pedagogical training. CI and CK are both from Bulgaria, learning German as at least a third language, and coming from a different language learning environment than most of the students.

For the weakest students, namely CA and UF, who correctly linked only 2 of the 14 pronouns, or 7 percent, and UO, 3 correct linkages or

11 percent, the personal pronouns referring to characters in the text were indeed the easiest to link with their referents, as I had expected. UF linked items 4 and 5 correctly, both personal pronouns, one singular and one plural.

> Er (4) ist verheiratet und hat kleine Kinder. Sie (5) wohnen aber im Münchner Raum. (He is married and has small children. They live in the Munich area.)

UO linked items 4 and 12, both singular personal pronouns.

> beim ersten kranken Tag brauchte er (12) mich weder zu kontrollieren noch... (on the first sick day he doesn't have to check up on me or . . .)

CA's two correct items were 2 and 9.

> "ich kenne keine Frau von fünfzig, der (2) das große Glück über den Weg läuft." (I don't know of any fifty-year-old woman for whom good fortune crosses her path.)

> ...und sie (9) Fragen dazu stellen wollte. (. . . and wanted to ask her questions about it.)

While the latter was a personal pronoun, item 2 is the dative relative pronoun that I had imagined would be more difficult for students than the relative pronoun in the nominative case (item 14). As noted earlier, this was the item that attracted the most correct responses.

Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

One encouraging message that came from this exercise is that L2 readers are willing to search for form/meaning relationships, even when offered an easy way out of doing so. I'd like to think that this tendency is a result of pedagogical practice in which less time is spent talking *about* language in classrooms and more on *using* it meaningfully and in a real-language task, such as reading. Ellis (1990) has stated that classroom research should pay more attention to "what learners can do in real-life situations than what they know but may be unable actually to use" (p. 200). He describes a classroom researcher as one who

> *seeks to show how instructional events cause or impede the acquisition of a second language. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to*

> *(1) identify which instructional events are significant, (2) find valid and reliable measures of the L2 learning that takes place and (3) be able to demonstrate that the relationship between instructional events and learning is in some way causal (1990, p. 199).*

While he goes on to caution that researchers "have faced a number of problems in carrying out each of these tasks," he nevertheless admonishes his readers to continue in this vein so that rather than being simply "consumers of research," we will "build our own theories of how learning takes place through instruction" (p. 204). If one regards a task as an "instructional event," then tasks centering on anaphoric resolution can be defended on a number of counts. Berkemeyer's (1994) research has already established that "there is a significant positive relationship between coreferential tie comprehension and overall text comprehension for readers of German" and led her to encourage instructors to teach grammar "within a discourse context" (p. 20). There is, therefore, justification for introducing this type of task at the beginning level of language learning and for encouraging novice teachers to recognize the value of such activities for the acquisition process.

To make such tasks more rewarding and entertaining, another variation is to involve students in creating exercises to challenge their peers. An initial experiment with a first-semester class indicated that creating a puzzle for fellow learners could be effective in helping beginning German students to focus on the suprasentential uses of anaphora, the cohesive aspects that lend meaning to the isolated pronominal forms. After working with a given text in which they linked pronouns to their referents, students then wrote a paragraph in which pronouns were used whenever a noun had been introduced. The competitive component of the task led them to reflect far more on the form/meaning relationship than a simple "fill in the blank" exercise and, when presented to peers on overhead transparencies, provided meaningful feedback on the successes (as well as errors) in their texts. A more formal experiment is needed to demonstrate a "valid and reliable measure" of the learning that took place.

Where the lesson focus is on reading comprehension, learners will be given the task of selecting passages from assigned texts to challenge their classmates. This will have the added bonus of leading L2 readers to analyze a text for a range of cohesive devices, to note what challenges or confuses. Especially with mystery novels or texts with sudden switches in perspective, from first person to third person narrator, for example, such assignments would help readers keep track of characters. Over a series of texts, L2 readers may come to notice stylistic differences. Their own writing may also benefit from this focus on the discourse structure of authentic input. They may also move up the ACTFL pyramid to become an advanced FL writer who "uses a limited number of cohesive devices, such as pronouns, accurately" (ACTFL 1986).

Works Cited

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 1986. *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.* Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL.

Barnett, Marva A. 1989. *More Than Meets the Eye—Foreign Language Reading: Theory and Practice.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Berkemeyer, Victoria C. 1994. Anaphoric Resolution and Text Comprehension for Readers of German. *Unterrichtspraxis* 27(2): 15–22.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth B. 1988. (as cited by Berkemeyer 1994) *Merging Research and Assessment Perspectives in Foreign Language Reading.* Technical report submitted to the Institute of Advanced Studies Mellon Fellowship Program. Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center.

______. 1991. *Reading Development in a Second Language: Theoretical, Empirical and Classroom Perspectives.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ellis, Rod. 1990. *Instructed Language Acquisition: Learning in the Classroom.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Lee, James F., and Diane Musumeci. 1988. On Hierarchies of Reading Skills and Text Types. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 173–187.

Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moser, Beverly, Dolly J. Young, and Darlene F. Wolf. 1997. *Schemata. Lesestrategien.* Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Nunan, David. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge Language Teaching Library. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Swaffar, Janet, Katherine Arens, and Heidi Byrnes. 1991. *Reading for Meaning. An Integrated Approach to Language Learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Weinrich, Harald. 1993. *Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache.* Mannheim, Germany: Dudenverlag.

Appendix A

An Exercise for Checking Anaphora and Cataphora in *Der Hahn ist tot* (Noll 1991)

Meistens bezieht sich ein Pronomen auf etwas, was vorher im Text steht, meistens auch auf ein einziges Wort. Ein Pronomen kann sich auch auf eine Phrase oder einen Satz beziehen, oder auf etwas Kommendes deuten. Sehen Sie sich die unterstrichenen Pronomen an und markieren Sie mit einem Kreis und einem Pfeil worauf sie sich beziehen. Das erste Pronomen ist schon als Beispiel so markiert. Manchmal benutzt man ein neutrales "es", einfach damit ein Verb nicht ohne Subjekt steht. In diesem Fall, verbinden Sie das "es" mit dem dazugehörigen Verb.

Translation of directions: Usually a pronoun refers to something preceding it in a text, usually just a single word. A pronoun can also refer to a phrase or a sentence or refer to something that will follow. Look at the underlined pronouns and mark with a circle and an arrow the word or phrase to which it refers. The first pronoun is marked in this way to provide you with an example. Sometimes a neutral "es" is used simply to avoid a verb standing without a subject. In this case, connect the "es" to the verb with which it agrees.

> (Seite 50)
>
> Denk dir, ich habe einen netten Mann kennenglernt", erzählte Beate und schilderte mir die Vorzüge eines zehn Jahre jüngeren Handelsvertreters.
>
> Obgleich ich ahnte, daß Beate offenes Haus und Bett hielt, wurde ich ironisch: "Ist das (1) jetzt also das große Glück?" fragte ich.
>
> Beate ließ sich nicht ärgern. "Ach du", meinte sie, "ich kenne keine Frau von fünfzig, der (2) das große Glück über den Weg läuft. Ich will dir die Schattenseiten auch nicht verschweigen: Er (4) ist verheiratet und hat kleine Kinder. Sie (5) wohnen aber im Münchner Raum, und er (6) fährt nur am Wochenende heim."

(Seite 105-106)
Nicht aufmachen! war mein erster Gedanke. Und weiter: So häßlich, wie ich im Augenblick bin, sollte mich keine Menschenseele zu Gesicht bekommen! Aber es (7) fiel mir ein, daß ich mich offiziell krank gemeldet hatte; es (8) war immerhin möglich, daß der Chef den eiligen Vorgang auf meinem Schreibtisch einer Kollegin in die Hand gedrückt hatte und sie (9) Fragen dazu stellen wollte. Aber hätte sie (10) dann nicht angerufen? Oder war es (11) der Chef selbst? Ausgeschlossen; ich fehlte schließlich nie, beim ersten kranken Tag brauchte er (12) mich weder zu kontrollieren noch mir Blumen zu bringen. Also dann die Polizei.
Ich fuhr in einen räudigen Bademantel und schlappte, kalten Schweiß auf der Stirn und übel aus dem Halse riechend, an die Wohnungstür. Ich drückte auf den Knopf und machte auf. Witold stand direkt vor mir, die Haustür war unten nicht verschlossen gewesen.

. . . .

Wie wunderbar wäre es (13) gewesen, wenn ich sein Kommen geahnt hätte. Dann wäre ich in den lasziven seidenen Schlafanzug, der (14) an alte Greta-Garbo-Filme erinnert, geschlüpft, hätte gebadet und die klebrigen Haare gewaschen und midestens zehn Minuten lang die Zähne geputzt.

Ich ließ mich aufs Sofa fallen und sah ihn (15) mit meinen roten Augen an.

Appendix B: Breakdown of Items on Anaphora and Cataphora Exercise from *Der Hahn ist tot* (Noll 1991)

Response Tally—Responses from both groups, 28 students

Items	Description/Identification	Correctly Connected to Referent	Incorrectly Connected to Referent	Ignored by Student	Totals
1. das	refers to a phrase given to students as an example				
2. der	feminine dative relative pronoun	25	3	0	28
3. es	subject marker- (Es gibt)	5	13	8	
	linked to phrase	2			28
4. er	singular personal pronoun	23	3	2	28
5. sie	plural personal pronoun	16	10	2	28
6. er	personal pronoun	21	4	3	28
7. es	A) subject marker	2	13	3	
	or B) linked to phrase	10			28
8. es	A) subject marker	2	9	9	
	or B) linked to phrase	8			28
9. sie	personal pronoun	20	5	3	28
10. sie	personal pronoun	19	6	3	28
11. es	A) referring to an unknown person about whom the speaker is conjecturing	2	18 (7 @ a)	8	28
12. er	personal pronoun+	22	3	3	28
13. es	A) subject marker	3	3	3	
	or B) linked to phrase	19			28
14. der	masculine nominative relative pronoun	20	6	2	28
15. ihn	personal pronoun	20	6	2	28
Totals		239	102	51	392

a -The student linked the pronoun with the verb *angerufen*, a logical conclusion although incorrect.

Appendix C

Tally of Correct and Incorrect/Ignored Responses by Group C Students

Student Name	Item Number																
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total +	Total –	Total 0
CJ	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–a	+	+	–	+	11	3	0
CL	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	–	–a	+	+	+	+	10	2	2
CS	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	10	0	4
CM	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–	9	5	0
CK	+	+*	+	+	+	+*	+*	+	+	–a	+	+*	+	–	12	2	0
CB	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	–a	–	+	+	–	7	7	0
CI	+	+*	+	+	+	+*	+*	+	+	–	+	+*	+	–	2	12	0
CA	+	0	0	0	0	–	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	11
Total +	8	4	5	5	5	6	4	8	6	1	5	7	6	3	73		
Total –	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	5/4a	2	0	1	4		22	
Total 0	0	3	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	2	1	1	1	1			17

Key: + = item correctly identified
– = item incorrectly identified
0 = item ignored/overlooked
+* = the student marked the pronoun as a subject marker
a = the student linked the pronoun with the verb *angerufen*, a logical conclusion although technically incorrect

Note: The first item was given to students and thus not tallied.

Appendix D: Tally of Correct and Incorrect/Ignored Responses by Group 2 Students

Student ID	Item Number 2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total +	Total –	Total 0
U A	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	8	0	6
U B	–	–	+	–	+	–	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	6	4	4
U C	+	0	0	–	0	–	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	4	2	8
U D	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	10	4	0
U E	+	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–•	5	9	0
U F	–	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	2	4	8
U G	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–a	+	+	+	+	12	2	0
U H	+	–	+	0	+	–	0	–	–	–a	+	+	+	0	6	5	3
U I	+	+	+	+	+	–•	–•	+	+	+	+	–•	+	+	11	3	0
U J	+	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	8	5	1
U K	+	0	+	+	+	–	–	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	10	2	2
U L	+	–	+	–	+	–	0	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	8	5	1
U M	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	0	9	4	1
U N	+	0	+	–	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	–	+	8	2	4
U O	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	3	11	0
U P	+	+•	+	+	+	+•	+•	–	–	+	+	+•	+	+	12	2	0
U Q	+	–	+	–	+	–	–	+	+	0	+	–	+	+	8	5	1
U R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–a	+	+	–	+	12	2	0
U S	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+	+	–a	+	+	+	–	9	5	0
U T	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	12	1	1
Total +	17	3	18	11	16	6	6	12	13	5	17	15	14	10	163		
Total –	3	12	1	8	2	12	8	5	5	8	1	3	5	4		77	
Total 0	0	5	1	1	2	2	6	3	2	7	2	2	1	6			40

Key: + = item correctly identified
– = item incorrectly identified
a = the student linked the pronoun with the verb *angerufen*, a logical conclusion although technically incorrect
0 = item ignored/overlooked
+• = the student marked the pronoun as a subject marker

Note: The first item was given to students and thus not tallied.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contributors

Carl S. Blyth is Assistant Professor of French Linguistics in the Department of French and Italian at the University of Texas at Austin. He coordinates the Lower Division French language program, supervises TAs, and teaches courses in French linguistics, sociolinguistics, and foreign language teaching methodology. His research interests include conversation analysis, narrative analysis, discourse grammar, sociocultural theories of language learning, pedagogical grammar, and instructional technology. For the past several years, he has explored the applications of computer technology to foreign language learning culminating in a recently published book and companion web site titled *Untangling the Web: Nonce's Guide to Language and Culture on the Internet* (1999). In collaboration with graduate students and departmental colleagues, he has recently completed an on-line reference grammar of French that includes recordings and self-correcting exercises called "La grammaire de l'absurbe: Tex's French Grammar" (1999).

Heidi Byrnes is Professor of German/Linguistics at Georgetown University. Her research focus within second-language acquisition (SLA) is the advanced instructed learner of German, particularly the learners' acquisition of academic literacy in a second language, as well as discourse analysis and crosscultural discourse. Her interest in instructed learning has led to a complete restructuring of the undergraduate curriculum in the German Department at Georgetown University with a content focus. Her most recent publication is an edited volume titled *Learning Second and Foreign Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship* (New York: MLA, 1998), which provides an overview of the field, including curricular recommendations regarding content-based approaches to second-language learning.

Catherine C. Fraser is Associate Professor and Language Coordinator at Indiana University, Bloomington. In addition to designing curricula, coordinating, and supervising the teaching of language courses in the Department of Germanic Studies, she is Advisor to students in the Master of Arts in Teaching program. She teaches a range of undergraduate courses as well as graduate courses on methodology and task design. A current research interest is combining her earlier training in literature with lan-

317

guage pedagogy as she focuses on tasks to facilitate students' reading and response to a range of texts. In addition to those on literary topics, she has published articles on collaborative learning and applications of technology to language learning. She is currently President of the AAUSC.

Sarah Jourdain is Assistant Professor of Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching at the State University of New York, Stony Brook. She supervises teacher trainees in French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish and teaches courses in Second Language Acquisition, Language Teaching Methodology, Applied Linguistics, and French. She has published articles in *The French Review* and *Foreign Language Annals* and has developed materials for the introductory French textbook package, *Chez nous*.

Celeste Kinginger is Associate Professor of French and Foreign Language Acquisition at the Pennsylvania State University where she offers courses in applied linguistics and language education. Her research interests include teacher education, sociocultural theory, classroom discourse analysis, and site-independent language learning. Her publications have appeared in several edited volumes as well as the AAUSC series, the *Modern Language Journal*, the *Canadian Modern Language Review*, and the *French Review*.

James F. Lee is Associate Professor of Spanish, Director of Language Instruction, and Director of Programs in Hispanic Linguistics in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Indiana University. He is the coauthor of *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen* and the author of *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms*. He and Bill VanPatten serve as General Editors for the McGraw-Hill Second Language Professional Series.

Ronald P. Leow is an Associate Professor of Spanish Applied Linguistics in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Georgetown University. He is the Director of the Spanish Basic Language Instruction Program and provides graduate-student education for that department. He has published several articles in refereed journals such as *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *Language Learning*, *World Englishes*, *Applied Language Learning*, and *The Modern Language Journal*. His primary areas of interest are second-language acquisition, curriculum development, teacher education, and classroom research, especially under the attentional framework of language learning.

Susanne Rott is Assistant Professor of German and Language Program Coordinator at the University of Illinois at Chicago. She supervises graduate teaching assistants and teaches courses in second-language acquisition research and language pedagogy. Her research interests include foreign language learner's vocabulary development, reading strategy use, and training.

Cristina Sanz is an Assistant Professor of Spanish and Catalan Linguistics at Georgetown University where she directs the Spanish Intensive Program and teaches graduate seminars in SLA, as well as Catalan and teacher education courses. Her publications on input processing and second-language acquisition, the effects of bilingualism on third-language acquisition, and Catalan sociolinguistics have appeared in *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *The Catalan Review*, *Lynx*, *MIT Working Papers*, *SAL*, and *Sintagma*, as well as in edited volumes. She is currently working on a volume on cognition and Spanish bilinguals and on a project on computer-assisted instruction.

Mary Ellen Scullen is Assistant Professor of French at the University of Maryland, College Park, where she is the coordinator and TA supervisor for the first- and second-year program in French. She teaches courses on French language, French linguistics, language acquisition, and foreign language teaching methodology. Her current research interests include the acquisition of French in immersion contexts, the acquisition and use of circumlocution, and theoretical phonology and morphology.

Bill VanPatten is Professor of Spanish and Second Language Acquisition and Director of the Division of English as an International Language at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has published widely in the fields of second-language acquisition and second-language teaching. He is the author of *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction: Theory and Research* and the coauthor (with James F. Lee) of *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. He is the founding and current editor of the journal *Spanish Applied Linguistics* and with James F. Lee is coeditor of the McGraw-Hill Second Language Professional Series. His pedagogical contributions include the widely used college-level text *¿Sabias que...?* and the award-winning PBS series *Destinos*.

AAUSC Style Sheet for Authors

In-Text Citations

The *AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction* series uses the author-date citation system described in *The Chicago Manual of Style, 14th ed. (Note that here and elsewhere a number of these references do not refer to a real work; they are for illustration purposes only.)*

1. Basic reference: If, from the context, the author is clear, use only the date within parentheses. If not, use the last name of an author and the year of publication of the work, with no punctuation between them. Note that no designation of "ed." or "comp." is used.

   (VanPatten 1993)

   Benseler and Cronjaeger (1991) provide the first comprehensive listing on the topic of TA development in foreign languages in their extensive bibliography.

   Although exhortations to the contrary are easily found (Allwright 1981), the textbook, particularly the introductory textbook . . .

2. For a reference with page numbers, use a comma to separate date and page number. Precede the page number(s) with p. or pp.

   (Byrnes 1990, p. 42)

3. For a reference with volume and page numbers use arabic number for volume, colon, and arabic number for page:

   (Weinberg 1952, 2: p. 129)

4. For a reference to volume only, add volume number to avoid ambiguity:

   (Weinberg 1952, vol. 2)

5. For works by two or three authors, use this form:

   (Smith and Jones 1991)

   (Smith, Jones, and North 1993)

6. For works by more than three authors, use "et al." If there is another work of the same date that would also abbreviate to "et al.," use a short title identifying the work cited.

   (Mitchell et al. 1992)

   (Mitchell et al., Writing Space, 1992)

7. For a work by an association or agency without a specific author, use the organization name in full. If the name is particularly long, you may abbreviate but be sure that the reader will be able to easily find it in the works cited and that it is used consistently throughout the text.

   (ACTFL 1994)

8. For two or more references, separate them by using a semicolon. Add a comma for page numbers.

   (Smith 1991; Jones 1992; Light 1990)

   (Smith 1991, p. 6; Jones 1992; Light 1990, pp. 72–74)

9. For multiple works by same author, do not repeat name and separate by comma if there are no page numbers. If there are page numbers, separate by semicolons and use commas for page numbers:

   (Kelly 1896, 1902a, 1902b)

   (Kelly 1896, p. 4; 1902a, pp. 120–22; 1902b, p. 45)

10. For a new edition of an older work; put the original date of publication in square brackets:

    (Piaget [1924] 1969, p. 75)

11. For a personal communication, do not include the reference in the

Works Cited section. Write the prose of the text to indicate personal communication, with the year given in parentheses:

*In a personal communication (1994), Tucker indicated that . . .

Works Cited Section

The AAUSC series uses *The Chicago Manual of Style* (14th ed.) "B" reference style. Consult Chapter 16 of *Chicago.*

Order of Entries:

Always alphabetize by last name of principal author; for questions of alphabetization, see *Chicago* Chapter 17.

1. If an author has both individual and coauthored works, all individual works precede coauthored ones.
    a. By date: oldest first
    b. If more than one work in the same year, order by alpha and add a lowercase a, b, c, etc.: 1993a, 1993b
2. Coauthored works:
    a. cluster together groups containing the same coauthors. Groups of 2 precede groups of 3, which precede groups of 4, etc.
    b. within each group, organize by date (oldest first)
    c. if more than one work with same date, organize by alpha using a, b, c.

Clément, Richard. 1980. Ethnicity, Contact and Communicative Competence in a Second Language. *In Language: Social Psychological Perspectives,* edited by H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, and P. M. Smith, 147–54. Oxford: Pergamon.

Clément, Richard, and Bastian G. Kruidenier. 1983. Orientations on Second Language Acquisition: 1. The Effects of Ethnicity, Milieu, and Their Target Language on Their Emergence. *Language Learning* 33: 273–91.

———. 1985. Aptitude, Attitude, and Motivation in Second Language Proficiency: A Test of Clément's Model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 4: 21–37.

Clément, Richard, Zoltán Dörnyei, and Kimberly A. Noels. Submitted for publication. Motivation, Self-Confidence, and Group Cohesion in the Foreign Language Classroom.

Three-em Dashes (———) for Repeated Names:

Do not use when a coauthor is first added. If the same author is used again, add 3-em.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1990a. Analysis of Motivation Components in Foreign Language Learning. Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Greece.

———. 1990b. Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign-Language Learning. *Language Learning* 40: 45–78.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Sarah Thurrell. 1992. *Conversation and Dialogues in Action.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall.

———. 1994. Teaching Conversational Skills Intensively: Course Content and Rationale. *ELT Journal* 48: 40–49.

Special Notes

1. Personal names beginning with "Mc" or any abbreviated forms of "Mac" should be indexed under "Mac" as though the full form were used.
2. For all state abbreviations, consult Chicago 14.17.
3. There is always a comma separating the names of authors, even if there are only two authors:

   Bernhardt, Elizabeth, and JoAnn Hammadou. 1987.
4. There are no quotation marks around article titles. Use quotes only when there is a title within a title. Books are in italics.
5. Abbreviate page-number spans according to 8.69.

Journal Article: One Author (16.104)

Note that identification of the issue is used *only* when each issue is paginated separately (in contrast to the common practice of consecutive pagination throughout a volume).

Lange, Dale. 1986. The MLA Commission of Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics: Comments and Advice. *ADFL Bulletin* 17: 28–31.

Journal Article: Two or More Authors (16.104)

Allen, Wendy, Keith Anderson, and Léon Narváez. 1992. Foreign Languages Across the Curriculum: The Applied Foreign Language Component. *Foreign Language Annals* 25: 11–19.

Organizations, Associations, or Corporations (16.52)

If a publication issued by an organization bears no personal author's name on the title page, it should be listed by the organization, even if the name is repeated in the title or in the series title or as the publisher.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 1986. *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.* Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL.

Edited Book (16.46):

Byrnes, Heidi, and Michael Canale, eds. 1987. *Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations, and Concepts.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Article in an Edited Book

James, Dorothy. 1989. Reshaping the "College-Level" Curriculum: Problems and Possibilities. In *Shaping the Future: Challenges and Opportunities,* edited by Helen S. Lepke, 79–110. Burlington, VT: Northeast Conference.

Book in a Series (16.86)

Magnan, Sally Sieloff, ed. 1991. *Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs.* AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Johnson, Carl L. 1944. *Professor Longfellow at Harvard.* Studies in Literature and Philology, vol. 5. Eugene: University of Oregon Press.

Article in Edited Book that Is Part of a Series

Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. 1991. The Question of Language Program Direction Is Academic. In *Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs*, edited by Sally Sieloff Magnan, 113–27. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

An Edition (16.79)

Pedhazur, Elazar J. 1982. *Multiple Regression Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction.* 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Publisher's Information Implies a Special Publishing Division

Light, Richard J. 1992. *Harvard Assessment Seminars Second Report.* Cambridge: Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Unpublished Thesis (16.132, if published see below)

Tucker, Holly. 1994. Echo in the Text: Rewriting in Charles Sorel's *Berger Extravagant.* Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Published Thesis (16.96 if microform; treat as normal book if otherwise. Note use of italics.)

Jones, Mildred. 1962. *Il Pastor Fido: Sheep and Their Shepherds.* Chicago: University Microforms.

Papers Read at a Meeting (16.133)

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. 1990. Preparing Inexperienced TAs for Second-Year Courses: Are Our Orientations and Methods Courses Adequate? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Nashville.

Forthcoming or In press (16.57)

Knight, Susan. Forthcoming. Dictionary: The Tool of Last Resort in Foreign Language Reading. A New Perspective. *Modern Language Journal.*

Waldman, Lila. In press. Bilingual Administrative Support Personnel in United States Corporations. *Modern Language Journal* 78.

ERIC Docs

Rubin, Joan, and Irene Thompson. 1992. Material Selection in Strategy Instruction for Russian Listening Comprehension. ERIC Doc. No. ED349796.

Membership in AAUSC

AAUSC

The American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs

Purpose

Since its inception in 1980, the AAUSC has worked

- to promote and improve foreign and second language education in the United States
- to strengthen and improve foreign language curricula and instruction at the post-secondary level
- to strengthen development programs for teaching assistants, teaching fellows, associate instructors, or their equivalents
- to promote research in second language acquisition and on the preparation and supervision of teaching assistants
- to establish a forum for exchanging ideas, experiences, and materials among those concerned with language program direction.

Who Can Join the AAUSC?

Membership in the AAUSC is open to anyone who is interested in strengthening foreign and second language instruction, especially, but not exclusively, those involved with multi-section programs. The membership comprises teachers, supervisors, coordinators, program directors, faculty, and administrators in colleges and universities that employ teaching assistants. Many members are faculty and administrators at undergraduate institutions.

How Do I Join the AAUSC?

Please fill out the following application for membership, and send it with annual dues to Janine Spencer.

Dues (including yearly volume)

Regular	$15.00
Student	$15.00 for two years

Please make checks payable to:

Janine Spencer
Secretary/Treasurer, AAUSC
Multi-Media Learning Center
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60208

AAUSC Application for Membership

New ☐ Renewal ☐

Name ________________________________

School Address ________________________________

____

City ____________ State ______ Zip ____________

Telephone (work) ________________________

Fax ________________________

Internet ________________________

Home address ________________________________

City ____________ State ______ Zip ____________

Telephone (home) ____________

Languages taught: Chinese ☐ ESL ☐ French ☐
Italian ☐ Japanese ☐ Portuguese ☐ Russian ☐
German ☐ Spanish ☐ Other ☐

Are you a: Teacher ☐ Program director ☐
Dept. Chair ☐ Graduate Student ☐ Other ☐

Issues in Language Program Direction

Preceding Volumes

1998: Research Issues and Language Program Direction
Editor: L. Kathy Heilenman, The University of Iowa

1997: New Ways of Learning and Teaching: Focus on Technology and Foreign Language Education
Editor: Judith A. Muyskens, Colby Sawyer College

1996: Patterns and Policies: The Changing Demographics of Foreign Language Instruction
Editor: Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro, The University of Iowa

1995: Redefining the Boundaries of Language Teaching
Editor: Claire Kramsch, University of California at Berkeley

1994: Faces in a Crowd: The Individual Learner in Multisection Courses
Editor: Carol A. Klee, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

1993: The Dynamics of Language Program Direction
Editor: David P. Benseler, Case Western Reserve University

1992: Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages
Editor: Joel C. Walz, University of Georgia

1991: Assessing Foreign Language Proficiency of Undergraduates
Editor: Richard V. Teschner, University of Texas at El Paso

1990: Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs
Editor: Sally Sieloff Magnan, University of Wisconsin at Madison

HH Heinle & Heinle
Thomson Learning

Boston, Massachusetts, 02116 U.S.A.
www.heinle.com

ISBN 083840846-X
90000
9 780838 408469

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL027912

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

BLANKET

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: AAUSC ISSUES IN LANGUAGE PROGRAM DIRECTION

Author(s): MAGNAN, SALLY SIELOFF

Corporate Source: HEINLE / THOMSON LEARNING

Publication Date: 11/14/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:

Printed Name/Position/Title: Sean Ketchem, editor

Organization/Address: Heinle, 25 Thomson Place,
Boston, MA 02210

Telephone: 617-289-7720

FAX: 617-289-7851

E-Mail Address: sean.ketchem@
heinle.com

Date: 9/30/03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	Heinle / Thomson Learning
Address:	25 Thomson Place Boston, MA 02210
Price:	$25.00

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)